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<td>------------</td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation.</strong></td>
<td>Acculturation is a developmental process which involves immigrants adapting to the culture and environment of mainstream society (Berry, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation gap/Dissonance.</strong></td>
<td>The disparity in cultural frame of references, often between immigrant family members as a consequence of dissimilar level of acculturation. The acculturation gap often leads to culturally-based intergenerational conflicts (Lung &amp; Sue, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation Strategies.</strong></td>
<td>The various manners in which immigrants seek to engage in the process of acculturation (Berry, 1997). John Berry identified four primary strategies that are based on high and low degrees of maintenance of culture of origin or accommodation to the new mainstream culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturative Stressors.</strong></td>
<td>Culturally-specific stressors that are unique to immigrant individuals and which have a negative impact on the individual's overall well-being (Lueck &amp; Wilson, 2010; Mui &amp; Kang, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternation Theory.</strong></td>
<td>Rejecting the linear conceptualization of acculturation. In alternation theory individuals can both retain cultural identity and acquire mainstream cultural identity (Smokowski &amp; Bacallao, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biculturals.</strong></td>
<td>In the current study, biculturals refer to individuals who are socialized in at least two cultures, one's own and the receiving culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Bicultural Competence.** | Individuals who possess the knowledge and behaviors to effectively participate in two different cultures. The must show competence in both mainstream and culture of origin across six dimensions: a. social groundedness, b. knowledge of both
cultures, c. positive attitude towards members of cultural groups, d. role repertoire, e. communication abilities, f. bicultural beliefs (LaFromboise et al., 1993).

**Biculturalism/Bicultural identity.** The current study focuses on the term *biculturalism* to refer to the case in which the individual is influenced by at least one culture of origin and at least one dominant culture (Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger, 2016). However, the author acknowledges that multiple cultural influences affect the individual. Therefore, in the current study, bicultural identity will also refer to multicultural identity.

**Collectivism.** Collectivism is characterized by communal-oriented values such as, well-being of community, favors relatedness, and values norms. Collectivist societies are countries such as China, Korea, certain Latin American countries, and others.

**Commitment.** A process in identity development where the individual chooses to internalize a set of values and/or ideologies (Marcia, 1966).

**Crisis.** Crisis refers to a state of uncertainty of who the self is and one’s role and purpose in life (Erikson, 1968). It also refers to a period of reexamining one’s values or beliefs, and explore alternative values and beliefs Marcia (1966).

**Culture.** “Common heritage or set of beliefs, norms, and values, shared group attributes, and a system of shared meaning” (U.S. DHHS, 2001, p. 14).

**Cultural-based conflicts.** Conflicts due to lack of shared cultural understanding, often between the older and younger family members (Juang, Syed, Cookston, Wang, & Kim, 2012).

**Cultural identity.** The subjective feeling of the sense of belonging to one or more country or culture. Aspects of cultural identity includes:
acculturation strategies (Berry, 1997) and ethnic identity (Phinney, 1990).

**CULTURAL DOMAINS.** Acculturation occurs across three cultural domains: practices, values, and identifications (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010).

**CULTURE OF ORIGIN.** The cultural domains (practice, values, and identity) of the immigrant family’s country of origin. In the current dissertation, this would refer to any cultures that are not part of the U.S. culture.

**ETHNIC IDENTITY.** An aspect of social identity theory that refers to an individual’s understanding about what it means to be part of an ethnic group(s). Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (2014) expanded on the definition of ethnic identity to include the changes in the beliefs about and attitudes towards one’s ethnic group over time.

**ETHNIC IDENTITY EXPLORATION/MORATORIUM.** The second stage of Phinney’s (1993) Ethnic Identity development model. Individuals begin to understand the implications of ethnicity and cultural meanings in their lives. This moratorium stage occurs most often during middle to late adolescence.

**ETHNIC IDENTITY ACHIEVEMENT.** The third stage of Phinney’s (1993) Ethnic Identity development model. The ethnic minority individual develops an understanding that one’s culture and ethnic group is different and holds a lesser social status than the mainstream group. The individual also has a clear and secure understanding and acceptance of one’s own ethnicity.

**ETHNIC ENCLAVES/ETHNIC COMMUNITIES.** Ethnic enclaves refers to communities characterized by a high concentration of population from the same or similar ethnic background, such as Chinatown in San Francisco, Little Havana in Miami, and Spanish Harlem in the Upper Manhattan,
Filial Piety. A Confucian concept that refers to the duty, respect, and obligations to one’s family, and to always put family’s wishes ahead of one’s wants and needs (Ikels, 2004).

Host Culture/Receiving Culture. The culture of the dominant society, also known as the mainstream culture. This refers to the practices, ideologies, and values of the country that is distinct from the individual’s culture of origin (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011).

Immigrant. Individuals or families who move to a foreign country with the aim to settle permanently or long-term (Padilla, 2006).

Individualism. Individualism emphasizes self-sufficiency, personal autonomy, privacy, uniqueness, initiative, and individual achievements. Individuals from individualistic cultures prioritize independence and personal goals over the well-being of the community or group (Coon, 2001).

Marcia’s Ego-Identity Status Model. James Marcia (1966) identified four primary statuses based on the dimension of exploration and commitment. Each status is characterized by specific personalities/coping style.

Nontraditional Immigrant Communities. In contrast to ethnic enclaves, these communities are characterized not traditional destinations by certain ethnic-racial groups (Marotta & García, 2003). In the current study, nontraditional immigrant communities refer to neighborhoods or cities with relatively small concentration of EAA members, such as Gainesville and Miami, Florida.

Social Identity Theory. Tajfel and Turner (1979, 1986) proposed the Social Identity Theory, which posits that an individual’s sense of belonging to a social group (i.e., social identity) influences
the way an individual understand the self, as well as shapes how one thinks and behave.

UNEXAMINED ETHNIC IDENTITY. The first stage of Phinney’s (1993) Ethnic Identity development model. In this stage, individuals who are unaware of what it means to belong to a culture or a cultural group.
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Adolescence is a critical period in the development of a coherent and healthy sense of self (Erikson, 1968). In addition to the normative developmental tasks, children of immigrant families must also contend with acculturation-based challenges (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Chun, 2004; Côte, 2009). Developing a bicultural identity was associated with better adjustment, mental health, and family cohesion (Schwartz et al., 2015; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Bicultural identity can also serve as a protective factor against acculturative stressors and promote positive mental health outcomes (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). East Asian American (EAA) adolescents may benefit from developing a bicultural identity. Early bicultural research has shown some promising results in fostering biculturalism in children of immigrant families, including positive psychological outcomes. However, the lack of replication studies impeded the development of new interventions and continued program development (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Moreover, scholars argued that the general lack of research in EAA youth culture also made it difficult for the development of bicultural skills training programs that are specific to EAA youth (Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2011; Stein et al., 2014; Zhou & Lee, 2004).
Participants included 51 EAA adolescents recruited from different East Asian ethnic churches in the southeastern region of the U.S. The author implemented a pretest and posttest, comparison and experimental group design. The treatment group condition received the bicultural skills training, and data were collected from a questionnaire at beginning and end of the four-week training. The comparison group was a delayed treatment group. They were administered the questionnaires the same time as the treatment group, and again after four weeks.

A simple linear regression suggested that increase in bicultural competence predicted increase in EAA adolescents’ well-being. Additionally, the results from the ANCOVA showed an increase in bicultural competence scores for the treatment group, but not for the comparison group. However, the results were not statistically significant. Thus, the East West Connection intervention was not effective in increasing biculturalism in EAA youth. The author concludes with a discussion for the implications for future counseling research and practice.
CHAPTER 1
EAST MEETS WEST: AN INTRODUCTION

Asian Americans has become the fastest growing minority group in the United States (Pew Center, 2013). This growth led to increased awareness of socio-cultural issues that affect the lives of the Asian American population in the United States of America (U.S.). There is a growing body of research within the field of counseling that focuses on the acculturation experiences of Asian Americans and its effect on well-being and development (Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2010; Kiang & Fuligni, 2010; Lee & Padilla, 2014). Yet, more studies are needed to determine the extent of the role of culture and identity in shaping adolescents’ well-being. The goal of the current study was to test the effectiveness of a bicultural identity developmental intervention program with East Asian American (EAA) youth. The study served as a guide to understand the intersection of acculturation and identity development, and how they affect EAA youth’s well-being.

In this introductory chapter, the author discussed the literature of cultural identity development in Asian American youth, as well as the role of socio-cultural factors in this developmental process. The researcher presents the background for the study, discusses the problem statement, and outlines the research hypotheses. Furthermore, the author highlights the diversity within the Asian American community, as this will provide a rationale to limit the scope of this study to focus on the EAA population.

East Asian American Youth in the U.S.: An Overview

Asian American is an overarching racial category that describes both foreign- and native-born U.S. residents, or descendants of individuals, who immigrated from a country in the Asia continent (Zhou & Lee, 2004). The term often conceals the
intragroup diversity within the Asian American population. However, not every individual embrace the pan-ethnic label Asian Americans embrace (Zhou & Lee, 2004). Zhou and Lee (2004) noted that individuals of Asian origin perceived that most Americans either cannot, or will not attempt to, distinguish one Asian ethnic group from the other (Zhou & Lee, 2004). In truth, few individuals of Asian descent, especially first-generation immigrants, identify themselves as Asians. Asian immigrants often prefer to be associated with their country and culture of origin, such as Korean, Chinese, or Japanese. Individuals of Asian ethnic origin considers the cultural distinction to be important because of the numerous differences between each Asian American subgroup; most notably related to values, language, cultural history, and immigration history (Lee & Mjelde-Mossey, 2004). For example, both Chinese and Hmong emphasized collectivistic values, however, their cultural beliefs and expression of collectivist values are different. These differences have a significant role in shaping an individual’s view of self, others, and the world (Zhou & Lee, 2004).

In considering the intragroup differences among Asian American groups, the current study focused only on the experiences of Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese and Korean Americans, because of their shared commonalities with regards to family centrality and collective orientation, which are both influenced by Confucian teachings. Together, they are known as EAA, which are the largest Asian American subgroups, accounting for approximately 42% of the Asian population in the U.S. (Pew Research, 2013). EAA were also one of the earliest group of immigrants to settle in the U.S. Despite their long history of settlement in the U.S., it was not until the last three decades
that they received more attention within the mental health research (Chu & Sue, 2011; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Since the research on EAA is relatively new, even less is understood regarding the mental health and development of EAA youth. In order to fill this gap in the literature, researchers need to consider the role of culture, generation status, and the socio-historical context of EAA in the U.S., and how they contribute to youth’s well-being.

**East Asian Culture**

Today, few EAA families purposefully adhere to the Confucian teachings and ethics, but the influences can still be observed in the EAA cultural practices and worldview (Ng, 1999). The East Asian culture is deeply rooted in the social and ethical philosophy of Confucian teachings (Ng, 1999; Wu & Chao, 2005, 2011). Succinctly, Confucian teaching emphasizes harmony, community, order, patriarchy, and traditions (Park & Kim, 2008). These cultural values influence how one understands the self, as well as guide one’s worldview and behaviors (Ng, 1999). Specifically, EAA individuals are socialized to fulfill their responsibilities in upholding the harmony and the welfare of the collective whole, especially family members’ welfare. Therefore, interpersonal relationships and interdependence are important elements in East Asian culture (Ng, 1999). With regards to identity, the self exists primarily in relationship to significant others, such as family, kinship network, and community (Tamura & Lau, 1992). An individual’s self-worth is connected to meeting the family’s expectations and contributing to the well-being of society, not in personal achievements or abilities (Chan & Leung, 1994). This cultural worldview is also embedded within East Asian cultural practices. Individuals are expected to exercise selflessness and self-restraint, prioritizing the
needs of others, before own personal preferences or needs. Related to the notion of interdependence, filial piety is an important concept unique to East Asian culture. Filial piety refers to the duty, respect, and obligations to one’s family, and to put the wishes of family members before one’s own wants and needs (Ikels, 2004). Filial piety is expressed through practices such as deferring and venerating elders, upholding the family’s honor, and supporting children in achieving academic excellence (Koh et al., 2009).

EAA consider culture and traditions to be a central part of their sense of self, and often place great importance in preserving the practices and values of their culture of origin (Juang, Syed, Cookston, Wang, & Kim, 2012; Koh, Shao, & Wang, 2008). Indeed, despite having immigrated to or lived in the U.S. for an extended amount of time, EAA often retain aspects of their culture of origin. At the same time, it is also necessary for immigrants to adapt to the cultural norms (i.e., acculturate), if they wish to thrive in the U.S. (Berry, 1997). Every immigrant minority groups experience the challenges of acculturation differently. For EAA, the unique challenges of acculturation are with regards to adapting to values and practices that are distinct from the EAA culture. For example, the U.S. culture has been described as emphasizing independence and self-directedness, which contradicts many EAA values. EAA youth, needing fulfill the demands both at home and within the dominant society, must become proficient in both cultures. The balancing of two (or more) culture has been known to be stressful due to the culture clashes one experiences (Berry, 1997; Xie, 2013). In general, most immigrants adapt to their new circumstances well over time (DeAngelis, 2011). Since
culture is very important for EAA individuals and families, the author regards it important to conceptualize EAA youth’s mental health and development by considering the influences of their culture of origin and the U.S. mainstream culture.

**Generational Status**

In addition to culture, generational status has significant importance in understanding the EAA youth’s developmental experiences. Rumbaut (2004) noted that it is important to distinguish a foreign-born person from a person raised by immigrant parents. Foreign-born EAA were socialized in their country of origin; therefore, they were socialized more in the East Asian cultural practices and norms. Then, they began a new life in the U.S. as adults. These individuals are known as *first-generation immigrants*. The children of first-generation immigrants are known as *second-generation immigrants*. Second-generations immigrants have greater exposure to the U.S. culture, but have few connections to their family’s culture of origin (Padilla, 2008). Because their parents often continue to uphold values from the East Asian culture, children still have exposure to their culture of origin’s practices, values, and languages at home (Koh, Shao, & Wang, 2009). However, such cultural learning is only done in isolation with little environmental support, which is even more difficult when the family does not live near an ethnic community (Padilla, 2008).

Scholars identified a generation in-between first- and second-generations, namely the 1.5-generation immigrants (Rumbaut, 2004). The 1.5-generation immigrant generally refers to adolescents who immigrate to the new country before adulthood, but after childhood; approximately after the age of 12 (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). They have stronger ties to their culture of origin than second-generation youth because
of greater exposure and socialization to the culture during the early developmental period (Padilla, 2008). The 1.5-generation youth are also able to accommodate much faster to the U.S. cultures compared to first-generation immigrants. Portes and Rumbaut (2001) observed that both 1.5-generation and second-generation children become indistinguishable later in life in several areas, including speaking English, academic achievements, and cultural practices. Moreover, proficiency and fluency in one’s culture of origin diminishes with each subsequent generation (Padilla, 2008). Thus, the current study focused on both 1.5- and second generation EAA adolescents because they have a greater exposure and greater socialization in both the East Asian and U.S. American culture than later generation youth.

Socio-Historical Context

In addition to cultural and generational status, a third element to consider is the socio-historical context of EAA in the U.S. The first wave of EAA immigrants experienced rejection and hostility by other Americans. For example, they experienced legal exclusions and racial segregation until the late 1960’s (Chun, 2004). During this period, many EAA youth were excluded from participating in activities or socializing with other Americans (Chun, 2004). For example, many Chinese children were not allowed to attend school with mainstream Americans, but instead were forced to attend “Oriental” schools. In response to this hostile treatment, many EAA, especially those born in the U.S., embraced and adopted U.S. ideologies, values, and norms, while also renouncing their ties to their Asian culture of origin (Chun, 2004). While the movement towards cultural assimilation achieved its purpose in reducing hostile treatment by members of the dominant society, it also fostered a skewed perception of the U.S. and
EAA culture. Specifically, youth perceived the U.S. as more desirable and preferable to the EAA culture (Zhou & Lee, 2004). This perception negatively affected relationships in EAA families (Lee, Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000). Today, EAA youth still encounter racial discrimination, which is a critical risk factor for significant mental disorders or negative psychosocial outcomes for EAA youth (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998; Yoo, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2009).

EAA youth function at the intersection of the East Asian and the U.S. culture (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). Growing up in the U.S., they are primarily involved in two different worlds, their culture of origin and the U.S. mainstream culture, and must learn to navigate between them (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2002). Depending on generational status, whether first- or second-generation, youth experience cultural issues differently (Rumbaut, 2004). Lastly, the history of EAA racialization and discrimination in the U.S. continues to this group’s well-being negatively. These are some of the challenges that EAA youth experience throughout their lives. As previously noted, minimal research on the experiences and stress in EAA youths. Therefore, more research is needed to understand the EAA youth well-being, and development of counseling interventions that are specific to the needs of EAA youth.

**Background of Current Study**

Adolescence is a critical period in the development of a coherent and healthy sense of self (Erikson, 1968). In addition to the normative developmental tasks, children of immigrant families must also contend with acculturation-based challenges (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Chun, 2004; Côte, 2009). To begin understanding the
complex nature of bicultural identity development among EAA youth, the purpose of this dissertation was to investigate the relationship between culture, identity, and well-being.

Two leading positions, assimilation theory and alternation theory, inspired decades of research and development in understanding acculturation and identity. Assimilationist argued that immigrants should embrace the mainstream culture while shedding their culture of origin, so that they could blend in as members of the new environment; and therefore, gain acceptance by the dominant society (Chun, Organista, & Marin, 2003). The classic assimilation theory posited that individuals who adopt the receiving culture as their own, would be accepted by members of the larger society, while also gaining upward socioeconomic mobility (Warner & Srole, 1945). Adopting American-English as one’s primary language, endorsing American attitudes, and developing positive affiliation with Americans would ensure acceptance by peers and avoid being viewed as outsiders (Chun, Organista, & Marin, 2003). Researchers contended that assimilation was the most viable strategy in acculturation (Gordon, 1964; Sandberg, 1973). This prevalent belief guided many years of research and practices that promoted assimilation among immigrant youth. This endorsement of assimilation was apparent in policies and practices in the U.S. For example, California and Arizona each passed laws that mandated that school instruction be in English only and limited any bilingual learning in schools during the 2000’s (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011).

Discrimination contributes to the acculturation stress that immigrant families experience (Alderete et al., 1999). New immigrants often experience language
difficulties that become barriers to access different resources and services. In turn, immigrant individuals feel excluded from participating in the mainstream culture. Behaviors that deviated from mainstream norms are met with ridicule (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). For example, an individual who has difficulty speaking English or has a heavy accent are perceived as less intelligent. In many instances, immigrant families believe that in order to succeed in mainstream society, and address the challenges of discrimination, it is necessary to assimilate with mainstream values and norms.

Integration theorists, however, have contested assimilation theorists' assertion that cultural assimilation is a viable acculturation strategy for immigrants (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). In reviewing the findings of assimilation research, Greenman & Xie (2009) concluded that the positive findings through assimilation were overstated. An in-depth review of acculturation research showed that assimilation fit the experiences of immigrants from cultures that share similar norms and values, such as New Zealand, Germany, Australia among others (Feliciano, 2001; Schwartz et al., 2013). However, when immigrants from collectivist cultures, such as Latin America and Asia, applied the assimilation strategy, it did not lead to the same results (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2005). Instead, these researchers found that individuals from collectivist cultures with high levels of assimilation were engaged in risky behaviors (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2005), reported mental health problems (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011), and experienced more family discord (Wu & Chao, 2011). Thus, scholars shifted their focus to promoting biculturalism.
Statement of The Problem

East Asian American youth are confronted by the challenges of navigating between two different worlds with different sets of cultural norms. Situations where they experience conflicting cultural messages between home and school can lead to confusion about how they should think and behave (Giguére et al., 2010; Stein et al., 2014). As illustration, Paul Tokunaga (1998) articulated this cultural conflict he experienced as a teenager:

- Being partly in two worlds but not fully in either makes for a difficult high-wire balancing act. What makes it so tough is that Asian and Western values are often polar opposites. What an Asian American young person experiences at school and in the neighborhood is often in stark contrast to what she or he lives out at home. (p.14)

Indeed, EAA youth reported experiencing this balancing act in various areas of their lives, such as communication, interpersonal relationships, and academics (Yeh, 2002). Moreover, adolescents received conflicting messages about themselves. If left unresolved, this can lead to confusion about one’s identity (Yip, 2014). Researchers also found that cultural identity development was positively associated with mental health (Schwartz et al., 2016) and psychological well-being, while a diffused identity was associated with a negative well-being.

Other challenges, with regards to acculturation stressors, include intergenerational conflicts and racism. Without interventions, youth may be at risk for negative health and mental health outcomes, such as substance abuse, anxiety, and depression (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Alternation theorists contend that
developing a bicultural identity can be a strategy in counteracting the negative effects of acculturative stress (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2006). Haritatos and Benet-Martínez (2005) also argued that bicultural identity was associated with more advanced cognitive functioning for complex problem solving and decision making. To develop an integrated bicultural identity, it is necessary for an individual to develop bicultural competency in both the mainstream culture and culture of origin (Chen et al., 2008). The components of bicultural competence are cultural knowledge, social groundedness, bicultural efficacy, communication abilities, role repertoire, and positive attitude toward both cultures (David, Okazaki, & Saw, 2009; LaFromboise et al., 1993).

Despite scholars’ assertion of the benefits of bicultural development, there are few intervention programs that aim to promote biculturalism in ethnic minority youth (Schwartz et al., 2016). Only in recent decades have scholars given more attention to this area of research (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2006). Thus, to gain a better understanding of the process of bicultural identity development and its implication for health outcomes, more research is needed (Schwartz et al., 2016).

**Significance of the Study**

Early adolescence is a critical time for an individual to explore and develop his or her sense of identity. Adolescence can also be a confusing and challenging time for individuals, as they navigate through cultural norms and demands, in addition to developmental challenges. One of the dimensions of identity is cultural identity, which is often more salient for children of immigrant families, such as EAA youth (Kim & Omizo, 2005).
As the U.S. becomes more diverse, counselors need to possess the awareness, knowledge, and skills in serving culturally diverse clients. The present study expanded on existing research through testing a bicultural skills training intervention program for EAA youth. The current study also added to the knowledge of EAA mental health.

**Research Hypothesis**

This study was guided by acculturation and identity literature (Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002; LaFromboise et al., 1997; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011), and research on EAA youth development and well-being (Yeh, et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2012). First, the current study was developed through reviewing the research literature on EAA youth’s identity, acculturation experience, and mental health. Second, the research literature also guided the development of a bicultural skills training intervention. The researcher examined the relationships between identity, culture, and mental health outcomes. This led to the following research hypotheses:

**Research Hypothesis One**

Bicultural competence (as measured by the Bicultural Self-Efficacy Scale [BSES]; David, Okazaki, & Shaw, 2009) in both Asian and U.S. American cultures is correlated with the development of bicultural identity (as measured by the Asian American Multidimensional Scale [AAMAS]; Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004) in EAA youth.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

An increase in level of bicultural competence predicts an increase in level of subjective well-being (as measured by the Student Life-Satisfaction Scale [SLSS]; Huebner, 1991) in EAA youth.
Research Hypothesis Three

An increase in bicultural competence predicts a decrease in parent-child conflicts (as measured by the Asian American Conflict Scale [FCS]; Lee, Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000) in EAA families.

Research Hypothesis Four

EAA adolescents participating in the bicultural skills development intervention program will demonstrate an increase in bicultural competence, while those in the comparison group will show no changes in bicultural competence.

Chapter Summary

This chapter focused on the layers of complexities that shape the identity development of EAA youth. The researcher discussed the importance in acknowledging the diversity within the Asian American population. The differences between Asian cultures have important implications for understanding the developmental experiences of EAA youth. Next, the author presented an overview of the experiences of early EAA immigrants in the U.S. The consequences of racialization have long-reaching effect for today’s youth. Then, the researcher focused on the experiences of EAA youth as they learn to balance both Asian and U.S. American cultures. Researchers have found that the development of a bicultural identity is associated with better adjustment, mental health, and family cohesion (Schwartz et al., 2015; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Bicultural identity may also serve as a protective factor against acculturative stressors and promote positive mental health outcomes (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). In conclusion, EAA adolescents may benefit from developing a bicultural identity.
Early bicultural researchers have found promising results in fostering biculturalism in children of immigrant families, including positive psychological outcomes. However, the lack of replication studies impedes the development of new interventions and continued program development (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Moreover, scholars argued that the general lack of research in EAA youth culture has also made it difficult for the development of bicultural skills training programs that are specific to EAA youth (Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2011; Stein et al., 2014; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Therefore, the goal of this study was to advance bicultural research focusing on EAA youth. The next chapter is a review of the relevant literature focused on EAA youth and theories of identity development and acculturation.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The current chapter includes an examination of the relevant literature regarding identity development models, cultural identity, and the state of biculturalism research within the scope of EAA mental health well-being. The first section focuses on identity formation theories during adolescence. Adolescence is a critical period of shaping one's sense of self (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1966; Yip, 2014). Identity developmental theories provide a framework in understanding human identity formation process. The majority of identity research has relied primarily on the works of Erikson’s (1956) psychosocial stages and Marcia’s (1966) operationalization of Erikson’s concepts. This section concludes with a discussion of the post-modern view of identity and identity development.

The second section focuses on the development of cultural identity and how it relates to EAA youth. An important, yet often taken for granted, component of identity is a person’s culture (Schwartz et al., 2013). Scholars have expanded classical identity theories to include the role of culture in shaping identity. They coined the term cultural identity to describe the cultural dimension of an individual’s identity. Cultural identity is particularly important for understanding children of immigrant families’ development and well-being (Schwartz et al., 2006). Therefore, the author discusses the research literature related to ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992) and acculturation (Berry, 1997); both of which are considered indices of cultural identity.

In the third section, the author discusses acculturation, including how acculturation stressors affect the well-being of EAA youth. The process of acculturation
is accompanied by different stressors, including accommodation to the norms, practices, and values of the mainstream culture (Berry, 1997). Immigrants from different cultures of origin experience acculturative stress differently. In examining acculturative stress of EAA, common stressors were often related to family roles, acculturation dissonance, and discrimination (Miller, Kim, & Benet-Martínez, 2011).

In the fourth section of this chapter, the researcher examines bicultural theory and reviews existing bicultural skills training programs. Bicultural identity theorists such as LaFromboise and colleagues (1993) suggested that cultural integration and bicultural skills served as a protective factors against the negative effects of acculturative stressors and racial discrimination. Researchers have developed culturally-responsive intervention programs that target problem areas in immigrant youth, while enhancing bicultural identity development (e.g., LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983; Szapocznik et al., 1986). While these programs have shown promising results in reducing the negative effects of acculturative stress, a lack of attention in bicultural studies has stymied the progress in bicultural training program development (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009).

Lastly, the researcher presents a bicultural training intervention curriculum developed for EAA adolescents. The curriculum was derived from empirical research findings and past intervention programs. The development of this curriculum entitled, East Meets West, was guided through synthesizing the research literature related to EAA identity development, acculturation theory, and bicultural theory. A summary of the development of the curriculum is discussed in this section.
Identity Development Models

Erik Erikson’s Stages of Psychosocial Development

Erik Erikson (1956), an ego theorist, proposed a model conceptualizing human development. He hypothesized that personality develops in a predetermined and linear manner; each developmental stage influences the subsequent one, the epigenic principle (Erikson, 1956). Erikson’s (1956) psychosocial developmental model delineated eight distinct developmental stages across the human lifespan. Additionally, Erikson emphasized the importance of the individual’s context in shaping one’s personality, which relates to the individual’s functioning and well-being (Erikson, 1956). In each stage, a person is confronted with a critical developmental task that he must resolve to further cognitive and affective development (Erikson, 1956). The eight stages, their corresponding crises, and the virtue gained through successful resolution of the crisis are outlined in Table 2-1.

Identity scholars generally agree that adolescence is the most critical period of identity development (Côté & Levine, 1987). Questions of identity become more salient during the transition from childhood to adulthood, as teenagers develop the ability to think abstractly (Schwartz et al., 2013). Adolescents seek answers to questions, such as “Who am I?” or “What is my purpose?”, to find meaning in life. Erikson (1968) called this the identity crisis. Identity crisis refers to a state of uncertainty of who the self is and one’s role and purpose in life (Erikson, 1968). Adolescents experiment with different roles as they develop their sense of self.
Erikson (1968) noted that adolescents vacillate between feelings of certainty and confusion throughout this developmental stage. He stated that adolescence as, 

A period that is characterized by selective permissiveness on the part of society and of provocative playfulness on the part of youth, and yet it often leads to deep, if often transitory commitment on the part of youth, and ends in a more or less ceremonial confirmation of commitment on the part of society. (p. 157)

Additionally, Erikson (1968) stated that part of the process of identity development involves the interplay between society and the youth. Society permits youth a set amount of time for exploration and experimentation with different roles and values without commitment. Adolescents form relationships, consider different career choices, and adopt values and ideologies that are distinct from the ones they held as young children (Jones & Abes, 2013). The youth, in becoming an adult, hopefully strives to become a positive and contributing member to the larger society. Second, there is an expectation that there is an end to the adolescence period (a psychological moratorium), but the allotted time differs from culture to culture (Côté & Levine, 1987). The length of time allowed for a psychosocial moratorium is tied to the norms and expectations of the socio-cultural context. For example, in societies where only a few people would pursue higher education degrees, individuals are expected to enter adulthood immediately following their secondary education. Thus, moratorium may occur between 12 – 18 years old. Conversely, individuals who pursue a college degree are given an extended moratorium (Schwartz et al., 2013).

In late adolescence, the individual has developed a coherent and integrated identity (Erikson, 1968; McLean & Syed, 2014). An integrated identity refers to a stable and clear self-representation that is consistent across time and contexts (Erikson,
1968). Furthermore, this identity is represented by the individual’s commitment to the values, norms, and behaviors valued by the larger society (McLean, & Syed, 2014). Identity also functions as a structure for self-understanding, to direct personal goals and beliefs that were derived from one’s commitments and values, and to give a person a sense of personal control over one’s direction in life both present and in the future (Adams & Marshall, 1996; Schwartz et al., 2006). Because identity development is closely related to an individual’s overall functioning and guides one’s life course, a coherent and clear identity is a central task for adolescents.

**Marcia’s Ego-Identity Status Model**

While Erikson’s (1956; 1968) writings were useful in conceptualizing the identity development process, his work was only theoretical in nature and based on his clinical observations of human development (Schwartz et al., 2013). Erikson’s concepts were not conducive for empirical testing because they were abstract ideas. In order to empirically validate Erikson’s theory, it was necessary to operationalize the concepts. James Marcia (1966) undertook this task in transforming Erikson’s theory into measurable concepts. Based on Erikson’s theory, Marcia proposed that identity development can only occur when the following criteria are present: *exploration* and *commitment* (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Marcia, 1966). Exploration refers to the period in which the individual engages in meaningful experimentation with values and choices that are different than ones from the individual’s childhood. Commitment refers to internalizing a set of value and beliefs as one’s identity. After a period of exploration, a person is expected to make a firm decision in adopting a set of values and beliefs which serves as a foundation for their sense of self (Erikson, 1968). Commitment is a
necessary step in constructing an identity. Marcia (1966) bifurcated both dimensions into high and low levels and crossed them to derive four identity statuses: (a) identity achievement (exploration leading to commitment), (b) identity diffusion (no commitment or exploration), (c) identity foreclosure (commitment without exploration), and (d) identity moratorium (exploration without commitment); see Figure 2-1 (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Marcia, 1966).

**Identity achieved.** The identity achieved status is characterized by both high levels of exploration and commitment. The individual has explored and experimented with values and beliefs that differ from one’s parents through engaging in a variety of activities, such as forming and maintaining peer relationships, learning about different cultures, or considering one’s future career. After considering the different values and beliefs, the individual commits and internalizes the set of values that become the foundation of their identity (Marcia, 1966). Individuals with an achieved identity possess a strong sense of self and self-determined ideals (Crocetti, Meeus, Ritchie, Meca, & Schwartz, 2014). In other words, they become knowledgeable about their goals, drives, and preferences, have an understanding of their purpose in life, and possess an internal locus of control (Schwartz et al., 2013). Identity achieved is associated with the highest level of well-being, low levels of distress and depression, and the ability to cope with different stressors (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). Thus, this ego-identity status appears consistent with Erikson’s (1968) concept of identity synthesis.

**Identity diffused.** The opposite of identity achievement is identity diffusion, which reflects Erikson’s concept of role confusion (Marcia, 1966). Characteristics of
Identity diffused individuals are low levels of exploration and commitment (Marcia, 1966). They had engaged in little or no meaningful exploration activities, and do not seem motivated to commit to any role or identity, which would result in a lack of identity (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). Without a sense of internal self-definition, these individuals lack purpose in life, are highly impressionable, and apathetic about life (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). The negative outcomes associated with identity diffused individuals include anxiety and depression, and they are easily influenced by others (Schwartz et al., 2015). Individuals who are diffused use avoidant strategies in various areas of their lives, such as low career aspirations, and avoiding commitments to work, a romantic partner, or family (Schwartz et al., 2015).

**Identity foreclosed.** Identity foreclosed status is characterized by low levels of exploration and high levels of commitment. Individuals make a firm commitment to a set of ideals or values, often the values of their family and caregivers, without exploring alternatives (Marcia, 1966). For example, an adolescent precipitated a decision to pursue a career as a physician, because he belonged to a family of doctors. Per Kroger and Marcia (2011), identity foreclosed individuals may appear well-adjusted and demonstrate self-directedness, particularly when the values of immediate social context are consistent with their own personal values. They are also more likely to conform to the expectations of authority figures (Marcia, 1966). However, they often react with anger or denial when experiencing deviations from their strongly held beliefs or values.
They also experience a sense of rejection, real or perceived, if they were to stray from these values (Kroger & Marcia, 2011).

**Identity moratorium.** Identity moratorium status is characterized by high levels of exploration and low levels of commitment (Marcia, 1966). Moratorium individuals actively search and consider alternative values and roles with no intention of committing with an identity (Erikson, 1968). They often experience higher levels of anxiety compared with individuals in identity achieved or foreclosed statuses (Marcia, 1966; Schwartz et al., 2015). Kroger and Marcia (2011) also reported that individuals in moratorium struggle to define themselves, and may become preoccupied with the different identity options. However, identity moratorium is also part of the normative process of identity development. In the best-case scenario, moratorium is a prelude to identity achievement status when they emerge from the moratorium with firm commitments and a better self-understanding. Conversely, individuals who become stuck in moratorium lack a stable identity and experience difficulties in various areas of their lives, such as commitment issues.

Marcia (1997) noted that his ego identity status model does not follow the epigenetic principle, like Erikson’s psychosocial stages (1956). Instead, contextual factors may create situations in which the individual must shift between identity statuses. For example, an individual may shift from identity achievement to moratorium status when changing careers or entering retirement. It is common for a person to experience multiple changes in identity statuses throughout one’s life. Marcia’s (1966) model was instrumental for subsequent identity studies.
Meeus et al. (2010) study illustrated Marcia’s model, in their longitudinal study of adolescents. In this study, the researchers examined the identity progressions of 923 early-to-middle adolescents (ages 12 to 14), and 390 middle-to-late adolescents (ages 15 to 17), from various high schools in the Netherlands across a five-wave longitudinal study. The researchers aimed to study whether a link existed between identity statuses and the personal disposition associated with each ego-identity status per Marcia (1966). The delineation of early-to-middle and middle-to-late adulthood groupings allowed the researchers to investigate the developmental period from ages 12 – 20 within the five-year study. Meeus and colleagues (2010) hypothesized that as adolescents transitioned between the ego-statuses, they would progress from moratorium to achievement. They found that approximately 63% of the participants remained in the same identity status through the five-waves, while the other participants transitioned at least once, with a few adolescents moving from achievement to diffusion or moratorium. This is consistent with Marcia’s (1966) hypothesis of shifting identity statuses.

There are a few shortcomings of Meeus et al. (2010) study. First, the study is descriptive; therefore, it does not explain how an individual transition between statuses. Second, the researchers used only one instrument throughout the study to group participants within identity statuses. Nevertheless, the findings provide empirical support for conceptualizing the process of identity formation. Furthermore, this is an area worthy of study because it is related to human development and mental health outcomes (Kroger & Marcia, 2011).
**Personal Identity and Well-Being**

Through operationalizing Erikson’s (1956) concepts, researchers evaluated the extent that identity statuses are associated with healthy mental health adjustments (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). Erikson (1950, 1968) posited that identity development is a central task of adolescent, because a synthesized identity results in a coherent sense of self that also functions to guide the “unfolding of the adult life course” (Schwartz et al., 2006; p. 5). Therefore, he proposed that successful identity formation was associated with healthy functioning and positive psychosocial outcomes (e.g., better coping, openness to new experiences). Conversely, failure to resolve an identity crisis would result in a state of identity confusion, which refers to the inability to enact or maintain commitments, and is represented by purposelessness in life. Other consequences of identity confusion are stunted personal development, reduced capacity in resolving the crises of the subsequent developmental stages, and mental health issues (Erikson, 1968; Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). For example, Vleioras and Bosma (2005) investigated the link between identity development and well-being in their study with college age students ($N = 230$). The researchers used the following indices for psychological well-being: positive opinion of self, environmental mastery, positive relationships with others, having goals, purpose and life, and satisfaction with life. The result indicated that participants with a diffused identity style had poorer psychological well-being.

The findings appeared consistent with Erikson’s (1963) and Marcia’s (1966) assertion that adolescents who fail to develop an identity (i.e., diffused identity) can experience difficulties later in life. While Vleioras and Bosmas’ (2005) study highlighted
the importance of identity development, it is interesting to note that the researchers did not find an association between identity achieved and positive well-being. In seeking to explain the lack of association, Vleoiras and Bosma (2005) reported the lack of consideration of the role of commitment in identity formation, a key concept in Marcia’s (1966) model. Nevertheless, identity diffusion is the least desirable status; and therefore, it is important to promote identity development among adolescents.

**Criticism of Early Identity Research**

The seminal work by Erikson (1956; 1968) and Marcia (1966) remain an important starting point in the current understanding of identity development. Both models conceptualized the experiences of individuals from a period where the sociocultural and economic context differed from the current social context (Schwartz et al., 2013). Erikson’s psychosocial stage model was developed during a period when individuals formed their identities within the well-defined roles of their occupations. The interim period between adolescence and adulthood was shorter in the past (Arnett, 2000). However, recent global economic shifts and technological advances lead to various social changes, including an increase career options, an increase enrollment in post-secondary degree, and delay in entering the workforce (Arnett, 2002). These societal changes resulted in an extended transition into adulthood for many individuals, especially those who pursued higher education. They are also afforded a longer moratorium to work through identity issues before entering adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Côté, 2000). Thus, Erikson’s original theory may not fully apply to the current social context (Schacter, 2005).
Another criticism of the literature by early identity researchers was its underrepresentation of Erikson’s developmental concepts (van Hoof, 1999). Researchers often overemphasized the classification of individuals, while also directing attention away from developmental issues (van Hoof, 1999). Schwartz, et al. (2013) argued that past theorists often adopted the view of exploration “as the process underlying identity development, and the commitment as an outcome of that process, appeared to carry the assumption that identity is somehow ‘finalized’ during adolescence or emerging adulthood” (p. 342). This view did not align with Erikson’s (1956; 1968) original writing. Instead, Erikson viewed the identity development process as dynamic and continuous throughout life, as the individual resolves a different crisis at each psychosocial stage. Furthermore, identities should be viewed as fluid, and changing according to the context in which the individual is positioned (Norton, 2000).

While Erikson (1963) acknowledged contextual factors that influence personal identity formation, cultural differences was deemphasized when discussed in the context of identity development. Identity development theory largely focused on the role of personal agency, such as the individual’s choice and self-directedness in selecting which values, goals, and beliefs to commit to (Côté, 2000). The idea of self-guidance and self-definition aligns with Western or individualist ideologies. In fact, Marcia (1966) acknowledged that his identity status model primarily applied to individualist societies such as the U.S., Australia, and New Zealand. Identity formation in non-Western contexts may be less driven by individual choices in commitments, but rather prescribed
social roles and responsibilities (Schwartz et al., 2013). Thus, early identity research appears to have limited applicability for individuals from a non-Western context.

**Contemporary Understanding of Identity Development**

Identity developmental research has undergone many changes since Erikson’s (1968) work in identity development. The advancement in research also revealed the complex nature of identity that past theoretical models cannot adequately capture (Schwartz et al., 2013). Currently, scholars contend that individuals should not view identity as a fixed phenomenon or as something that can be generalized to all individuals, groups, or nations, as past identity theorists suggested (Kouhpaeenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014; Miyaharay, 2010). Instead, individuals should view identity development as a dialectical process that is influenced by internal and external processes (Zhou & Lee, 2004). Wu (2011) stated that identity is constructed through self-reflection and interaction with important individuals in their lives. Identity development is not aimed to construct one overarching sense of self. Instead, an individual develops multiple identities and enacts each identity in response to the context and social relationships (Kouhpaeenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014). For example, an EAA youth possesses the identity of a friend, a sibling, someone’s child, a student, and a minority all at the same time. Individuals should conceptualize identity as contextually-driven and constantly changing (Miyaharay, 2010). Furthermore, identity is “fluid, multiple, diverse, dynamic, varied, shifting, subject to change, and contradictory” (Kouhpaeenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014; p. 200). Thus, identity development is a dynamic iterative process of constant construction and revision of one’s identity (Luyckx et al., 2006).
For the current research, the author emphasized the functional aspect of identity that affects an individual's well-being. As such, he conceptualized identity formation as an individual's attempt to negotiate between multiple social and personal roles (e.g., student, culture of origin, friend) in the process of defining a preferred self, while also fulfilling the demands of society (Zacharias, 2010). It is through the subjective feeling of having a coherent self-concept (i.e., a strong identity) and feeling capable of meeting the different social demands, that an individual can achieve a sense of well-being. Based on this view, the author considered it important to understand both the intrapersonal processes and contextual factors (e.g., culture, history, relationships) that influence identity formation; factors which are limitedly discussed in research (Schwartz et al., 2013).

Traditionally, researchers who explored identity development have underestimated certain contextual factors that shape, constrain, and guide the task in identity formation (Schwartz et al., 2013). In recent years, increased attention to multiculturalism and contextual influences prompted identity theorists to focus on cultural processes in shaping identity, and their association with behavioral and mental well-being (e.g., LaFromboise et al., 1993; Schwartz et al., 2006; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011, Tadmore & Tetlock, 2007). In the next section, the author discussed the role of cultural processes in an individual's identity formation.

**Cultural Identity**

Social scientists define culture as a set of shared meanings, values, and symbols used by a specific group that distinguishes them from other groups (Banks, Banks, & McGee, 1989). In this vein, researchers have focused on the differences between
groups of people from different parts of the world. Others view culture as a set of behaviors, both explicit and implicit, created and shared among a group of people, such as stories, knowledge, practices, and language (Lederach, 1995; Linton, 1945). This definition emphasized the tangible and observable elements of culture, while it also applies to specific and distinctive groups, such as youth culture.

While there is no single definition that captures culture in its entirety, the term culture does allude to a sense of belonging to a specific group or groups that share common values or practices. Much of the cultural research in the U.S. has focused on the cultural adaptation experiences of immigrant and minority groups (Schwartz et al., 2013). As Schwartz and colleagues (2013) noted, cultural constructs are the easiest to identify when the minority individual is undergoing changes. Pertinent to the current study, the author focused on the cultural processes that are linked to identity development.

According to Erikson (1968), the dynamic exchange of information between an individual and the context has a key role in identity development. One of the most important contextual factors is the role of culture in shaping one’s sense of self-definition and belonging. Due to an increasingly interconnected world and exchanges of cultural ideas, scholars have begun to draw on cross-cultural research literature to understand cultural factors (e.g., Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, 2006; C. Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008; Tseng, 2004). As a result, acculturation research has grown exponentially in the last four decades (Schwartz et al., 2010). Within this area of research, theorists proposed the construct of cultural identity in studying the
influence of cultural processes on identity formation (Giguére et al., 2010; Macrum, 2007; Schwartz, Zamboanga, & Weisskirch, 2008). However, research findings has been inconsistent with regard to the relationship between culture and identity (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Rodriguez, 2009; Suh, 2002). This is due to the lack of an agreed upon definition for cultural identity. Indeed, researchers have criticized the lack of an appropriate operational definition (Hunt, Schneider, & Comer, 2004; Rudmin, 2003). At the same time, given that the abstract nature of the terms identity and culture, it is understandably difficult to know what exactly defines cultural identity.

Nevertheless, an operational definition for cultural identity is necessary to conduct empirical work and application. For the current study, cultural identity refers to an individual’s sense of belonging to a group with shared cultural characteristics. Furthermore, the study focused on aspects of cultural identity that affect multiple domains of the individual’s life, including psychosocial and health outcomes. Researchers have often used various constructs to index cultural identity, such as ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992), acculturation (Berry, 1997), and language (Norton, 2000).

**Ethnic Identity**

**Social identity theory.** Early identity researchers often focused their attention on individuals’ intrapersonal processes, when studying identity. However, social psychologists Henri Tajfel and John Turner (1979; 1986) were interested in the role of social factors in influencing identity development. Together, they proposed the Social Identity Theory, which posited that an individual’s sense of belonging to a social group (i.e., social identity) affects one’s self-concept, cognition, and behaviors. Social identity,
also known as collective identity in the U.S., refers to an individual’s sense of belonging and feelings of strong emotional attachment to a social group. A social group refers to a group of individuals who perceive themselves as members of the same social category, such as race, religion, ethnicity, or occupation (Luhthanen & Crocker, 1992). Tajfel and Turner (1986) suggested that a person becomes socialized to the norms of their particular social group. Furthermore, research showed that a sense of belonging to a group contributed to a positive self-concept and increased self-esteem (Phinney, 1990). The individual would also derive a sense of value being associated with that group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). For example, a U.S. American individual’s sense of self-esteem is boosted when representatives of their country excel at an international competition or event. A person can feel belonging to multiple social groups; and therefore, possess multiple social identities (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

At the same time, individuals consider those who do not fit into their social group as outsiders or the out-group, and seek negative aspects (i.e., prejudice and discrimination) of the outgroup in order to enhance one’s self-concept (Tajfel, 1978). Thus, social identity theory appeared useful in postulating group and individual behaviors. Particularly, how one may behave in ways to increase a positive perception of in-group and increase negative perception of outgroup. Additionally, social identity theory can be used to explain how individuals understand themselves in relation to their reference group. Most importantly, social identity theory is a starting point for understanding ethnic identity.
Jean Phinney’s Ethnic Identity Development Framework. One of the most important aspects of an individual’s social identity is one’s ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Ethnic identity refers to an individual’s understanding of what it means to be part of an ethnic group(s). More recently, Umaña-Taylor et al. (2014) expanded the definition of ethnic identity to include changes in beliefs about and attitudes towards one’s ethnic group over time. According to Phinney (1990), the construct of ethnic identity has very little meaning within an ethnically homogenous society because issues of ethnicity are not as salient to individuals who share similar ethnic features and cultural practices. Instead, an individual becomes salient regarding his or her ethnic identity when he or she comes in contact with members of another ethnic group. Thus, scholars study ethnicity and cultural with immigrants and their children (Schwartz et al., 2013).

Researchers delineated ethnic identity development into content and process (Phinney, 1993; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). The content of ethnic identity refers to an individual’s attitude towards his or her heritage culture, engagement in cultural practices, and identification with a cultural group. According to Phinney (1990), engaging in cultural social activities and involvement with one’s ethnic group members fosters a stronger self-identification and positive attitude to one’s ethnicity. In measuring ethnic identity, researchers often focus on how often individuals engage in the cultural practices specific to their ethnic groups (Phinney, 1990). The process of ethnic identity, on the other hand, refers to how individuals explore, make meaning, and maintain their ethnic identity (Phinney, 1993; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014; Quintana, 1998). Exploration of one’s ethnicity, similar to the task of resolving one’s identity crisis (Erikson, 1968), is
necessary in order to begin formulating one’s ethnic identity. This exploration occurs through individuals involving themselves with members of the ethnic community and the cultural practices (i.e., content of ethnic identity). During childhood, individuals often identify with the ethnicity of their parents; however, this identification is superficial (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). As individuals become adolescents, they begin to consider the meaningfulness of ethnicity in their lives. After considering the meaningfulness of ethnicity for their identity, and internalized the values, they achieve a sense of ethnic identity. Phinney (1990; 1993) conceptualized this interplay of content and process in her ethnic identity development model.


**Unexamined ethnic identity.** The first stage, known as unexamined ethnic identity, relates to individuals who are unaware of what it means to belong to a culture or a cultural group. Some children and early adolescents are often unconcerned or have a rudimentary understanding about the meaningfulness of ethnicity in their lives (Phinney & Ong, 2007). They often hold the same attitude towards ethnic minorities as the mainstream culture. In other words, their frame of reference in understanding their
own ethnic groups is from the viewpoint of the dominant group. For example, an EAA youth may subconsciously adopt attitude towards their own ethnic group that is modeled after mainstream society’s attitude towards EAA (Pyke & Dang, 2003). The person has little understanding of their ethnic identity, and has not explored the meaningfulness of their ethnicity in one’s life (i.e., ethnic identity diffused). Individuals who are committed to the attitudes of their parents’ view of culture and ethnicity are considered ethnic identity foreclosed (Phinney, 1989). Within Phinney’s model, commitment is defined as the strength of one’s connection with his or her ethnic group. Thus, foreclosed individuals have not reflected on how their identified ethnicity affects their lives, but have instead adopted the views of their parents.

**Ethnic identity exploration.** In the ethnic identity search moratorium stage, individuals become aware of the implications of what their identified ethnicity means to them and how it can affect their lives. This moratorium stage often takes place between middle to late adolescence (Phinney, 1993). Scholars posited that significant social encounters or transitions increases during adolescence (e.g., discrimination, other cultural groups). These encounters create an awareness about one’s ethnicity (Cross, 1978; Kim, 1981). Kim (1981) described this awareness as an *awakening experience* that motivates the individual to explore what it means to belong to an ethnic group. Umaña-Taylor et al. (2014) noted that ethnic and racial issues become more relevant to youth as they navigate between the various social demands they encounter, thus increasing their awareness (e.g., choosing to self-segregate by ethnicity or become involved with other ethnic groups). Ethnic identity exploration occurs through immersion
in one’s own culture, such as actively participating in cultural events, interacting with members of own ethnic groups, or studying about one’s culture (Phinney, 1990). Sometimes this may result in adolescents choosing to reject the values of the mainstream culture. This may occur when adolescents perceive the mainstream society as discriminating against the identified ethnic group (Phinney, 1990).

_**Ethnic identity achievement.**_ The third stage of this model is known as ethnic identity achieved. This stage is characterized by the resolution and commitment to one’s ethnicity, after evaluating and revising one’s previously unexamined ethnic identity. Phinney (1990) described the resolution as understanding that one’s culture and ethnic group is different and holds a lesser social status than the mainstream group. Individuals who are ethnic identity achieved demonstrate greater certainty and pride regarding one’s ethnicity even in the face of discrimination and racism (Phinney, 1990; 1992). Researchers found evidence of a positive association of ethnic identity achievement with greater self-esteem and better psychosocial outcomes (Berry, 2006; Phinney, 1992; Chae & Foley, 2010).

_**From childhood to adolescence.**_ Phinney’s (1990; 1993) model represented an important starting point for understanding the developmental experiences of ethnic minorities. Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (2014) examined each stage of the ethnic identity development process in greater depth. During the toddler period, children are largely unaware of the significance of ethnicity and culture because they have an underdeveloped ability for complex and abstract thinking (Marcia, 1994). Similar to identity scholars’ assertion that an individual requires formal cognitive abilities (Marcia,
1994) to form a self-concept, ethnic identity theorists postulated that the sophisticated cognitive function, perspective-taking skills, was necessary for ethnic identity development (Quintana, 1994). Children possess a superficial understanding of ethnicity, mostly through awareness of physical features (e.g. skin color, accents). However, there is some evidence that children have certain racial attitudes towards other ethnic groups, but, in general, do not have the same sophisticated understanding of ethnic and racial issues as older adolescents and adults (Hirschfeld, 1994).

**Childhood.** Between the toddler and pre-teen years, children become more aware about issues of ethnicity. While children still lack the cognitive capabilities to develop an ethnic identity, they begin to form certain attitudes towards their own reference group and others (Quintana, 1998). Children are exposed to different experiences that prime them for ethnic identity formation. Therefore, parents have an important role in socializing their children in their heritage values, practices, and beliefs. Children also learn about their heritage culture through participating in cultural events (e.g., observing cultural celebrations), interacting with others, and being involved in their ethnic community, if such a community exists and is accessible. However, children still only possess a superficial understanding of the importance of ethnicity and culture (Phinney, 1990).

**Adolescence.** Minority youth begin to construct their ethnic identity with the development of formal operational thinking as they progress towards adolescence (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). The development of abstract thinking abilities enables the adolescent to integrate their personal identity with their ethnicity (Cross & Cross, 2008),
and thereby develop ethnic group consciousness (Quintana, 1998). This refers to the adolescent’s ability to view and evaluate the world from the perspective of that specific ethnic group. As an illustration, it is common for minority adolescents to form ethnic friendship groups based solely on shared racial and ethnic commonalities. They may exaggerate the degree of similarities with one another, while amplifying the differences between themselves and out-group members (Tajfel & Turner, 1978). Additionally, adolescents begin to explore what ethnicity means to them apart from what they had been taught by their parents (Phinney, 1990). Parents are strong influences who model racial attitudes for their children. Adolescents may begin to question their parents’ influences as they establish their autonomy (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009). However, not all adolescents take the opportunity to evaluate what it means to identify with their reference ethnic group (Phinney, 1989; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). These individuals become ethnic identity foreclosed (Phinney, 1993). Youth who do encounter an awakening experience may take an active approach in exploration (Phinney, 1990). This period is when youth enter the ethnic identity moratorium stage (Phinney, 1993). Exploration is done through immersion in cultural activities, increased awareness regarding their ethnicity and racial heritage, as well as thinking about what it means to be a minority member within the larger mainstream culture (Syed et al., 2013). Peer and other significant relationships can also be a source of cultural learning (Kiang, Witkow, Baldelomar, & Fuligni, 2010). Youth learn to develop transactional competencies through interactions with different people (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). It is through these interactions that youth learn about the norms and values of both the dominant and
heritage culture. In the U.S., adolescents communicate in English, engage in U.S. specific cultural practices and activities, and apply themselves to the U.S. worldview. These daily transactions are opportunities for youth to increase their knowledge and awareness of ethnic and racial issues, which can also affect their beliefs and attitudes toward ethnic groups, including their own. In sum, ethnic identity is constructed by considering the meaningfulness of belonging to an ethnic group (ethnic identity exploration), deciding the importance of identifying with one’s ethnic group (ethnic identity commitment), and fostering a positive sense of attitude and pride towards that ethnic group (ethnic identity affirmation/achievement) (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

**Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and adjustment.** The identity formation process for immigrant youth is complex and challenging. Yet, it is important that youth form a clear and coherent identity. Scholars have argued that a relationship exists between ethnic identity and mental health (Phinney, 1989; 1990; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). There are several reasons why it is advantageous for minority youth to develop an achieved ethnic identity. First, Schwartz et al. (2013) stated, “ethnic identity help immigrant individuals find their place within the larger society, as well as within cultural designations that, in many cases, do not exist in the country of origin” (p. 351). For instance, the ethnic label “Asian” is an ethnic identity adopted by individuals of Asian descent. This label is not embraced by all Asian American individuals (Zhou & Lee, 2004), yet an ethnic identity gives an individual a sense of solidarity with other Asian Americans, and it is advantageous within the U.S. Second, scholars contend that ethnic identity achievement predicted well-being and psychological adjustments (Schwartz et
Researchers demonstrated a modest but consistent correlation between ethnic identity and higher levels of self-esteem (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009). Finally, ethnic identity achievement helps minority youth focus on positive aspects of their ethnic group. This in turn leads to higher involvement with one’s ethnic group and cultural practices, and can serve as a protective factor against the negative effects of racial discrimination (Costigan, Su, & Hua, 2009).

Umaña-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, and Guimond (2009) demonstrated the association between ethnic identity and mental health outcomes. In their longitudinal study of Latino adolescents (N = 323), they observed adolescents’ ethnic identity development progression and correlated that with their self-esteem over a period of four years. Based on Phinney’s (1989; 1993) writings, the researchers proposed two hypotheses. First, progression of ethnic identity would (defined as moving from exploration to resolution to affirmation) increase over time, as adolescents enter mid to late adolescence. Second, the researchers posited that progression in ethnic identity development would predict the level of self-esteem. The results partially supported the first hypothesis in that ethnic identity followed a developmental progression. Exploration ($r_{ei} = .10; p < .01$), resolution ($r_{ei} = .04; p < .01$), and affirmation ($r_{ei} = .06; p < .01$) increased significantly for Latino girls, but only affirmation ($r_{ei} = .04; p < .01$) increased significantly for Latino boys. The researchers suggested that the findings from the first hypothesis may be related to the differences in overall maturation, with girls maturing earlier than boys (Adams & Gulotta, 1983). Secondly, the findings revealed that, on
average, ethnic identity exploration significantly predicted levels of self-esteem for the adolescents \(r_{ei} = .42; p < .01\).

In considering Umaña-Taylor and colleagues’ (2009) findings, there were a few limitations that warrant attention. First, the researchers did not consider whether potential differences existed between U.S.-born and foreign-born Latino adolescents. It is possible that the ethnic identity development process differs between both groups. Individuals who immigrated to the U.S. after the age of 12 are likely to have stronger commitments to their culture-of-origin; and therefore, may develop a stronger sense of ethnic identity (Zhou & Lee, 2004). Second, the researchers did not consider how environmental factors (i.e., encouraging diversity and multiculturalism) may have influenced the adolescents’ ethnic identity development. Adolescents who live in communities where they have limited encounters with minorities are more likely to become aware of ethnic and racial issues. Thus, ethnic identity becomes relevant at an earlier developmental age (Yip, 2014). Conversely, for individuals growing up in ethnic enclaves, such as the participants from Umaña-Taylor and colleague’s (2009) study, ethnic identity relevance often occur at a later age. Nevertheless, this study provided support for ethnic identity as a predictor of psychological well-being among ethnic minority youth.

Researchers have also found a relationship between developing ethnic identity and mental health variables (e.g., self-esteem, coping with stress, lower levels of depressive symptoms) among minority individuals (e.g., Costagin et al., 2010; Kim & Omizo, 2005; Yeh et al., 2003). Most research on ethnic identity and well-being were
conducted from the cultural adaptation theory framework. Scholars claimed that ethnic identity and acculturation are interrelated constructs that are both aspects of cultural identity (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Chang, Tracey, & Moore, 2005).

**Overview of Acculturation**

The second component of cultural identity relates to cultural acquisition or acculturation (Berry, 1997). Acculturation refers to the process of change an individual undergoes after a prolonged encounter with a different cultural system (Berry, 2005). The construct of acculturation first appeared in the psychology literature in the early 1930’s. Redfield, defined acculturation as the process of “adapting [to] the new culture through continuous exposure and socialization with the environment of the host country” (Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149). With regards to immigration, acculturation occurs when the individual had lived in the new environment over an extended period of time. The immigrant invariably shift from the values and practices of their culture of origin to the dominant culture’s values and practices. However, the conceptualization of acculturation has changed over the years, due to technological advancement and development of immigrant communities within the host country (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Rodriguez, & Wang, 2007). Advances in technology and better global transportation has allowed immigrants to maintain more consistent contact with their countries of origin. For example, it is easier to attain access to media and food from one’s country of origin, so families are more likely to retain some connection to their family’s culture. Additionally, relatively more affordable travel has allowed families to make occasional visits to their country of origin. Finally, there are greater cultural information exchanges via the internet. These factors have increased exposure to different cultures in the U.S.,
thus allowing immigrant families greater capacity to maintain their culture practices and values (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013).

Second, many early immigrants settled and built a small community in certain areas around the U.S. when they first arrived (Barry, R.C. & Miller, 2005). Over time, these communities developed into ethnic enclaves characterized by a high concentration of people from a similar ethnic and cultural background, such as Chinatown in San Francisco, Little Havana in Miami, and Spanish Harlem in Upper Manhattan, New York (Stepick & Stepick, 2002). These ethnic communities often reflect aspects of the country of origin, which can promote retention of heritage culture, while participating in the mainstream culture. They can support the transmission of cultural language, symbols, and traditions by parents to their children by providing an environment that reinforces enculturation (Berry & Miller, 2005; Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). Ethnic enclaves are growing within countries, including the U.S., with greater acceptance of diversity (Berry, 2006). This openness allows immigrants to embrace and retain their heritage culture (Schwartz, Benet-Martínez, & Unger, 2016).

Acculturative stress. Generally, immigrants adapt well to the new society as they become familiar with the norms of the dominant culture (DeAngelis, 2011; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). However, the process, especially during the early phases, of acculturation is known to be stressful as immigrants adapt physically and psychologically to their new context. This experience is known as acculturative stress (Berry, 1995; Miller, Kim, & Benet-Martínez, 2011). Acculturative stressor that affect EAA immigrants are often related to balancing multicultural demands, racial
discrimination, and changes in family structure. Furthermore, research has shown that acculturative stress negatively affects family relationships, which can lead to poorer mental health well-being for all family members (e.g., Smokowski & Bacallao, 2005; Wu & Chao, 2005). The author outlines each of these areas in the following sections.

An immigrant must learn to accommodate to the new social norms and demands of the mainstream culture to succeed within the host country (Marcrum, 2007). The degree of difficulty in adapting to the new norms depends on the degree of cultural differences between one’s culture of origin and the dominant culture (Miller et al., 2011). For example, Canadian immigrants, who share similar Western individualist norms (e.g., such as language, individualist values), experience fewer difficulties adjusting to the U.S. In contrast, Japanese immigrants, who share fewer similarities with Western culture, potentially experience more challenges acculturating to the U.S. (Juang et al., 2012; Lee & Padilla, 2014).

Culture and traditions are an important aspect of an East Asian identity (Ng, 1999). Examples of East Asian values are self-perfection through education, personal sacrifice for others, modesty, and filial piety, which are rooted in Confucian ethics (Yee et al., 2007). Some values may be incompatible with U.S. American values. For example, from the U.S. culture perspective, an individual is considered mature when one behaves autonomously, show high self-confidence, and is self-directed (Erikson, 1968). In contrast, East Asian culture portrays a mature individual as someone who recognizes and accepts their social responsibilities (Chen, 2000). Therefore, behaviors that suggest maturity in an East Asian cultural context may be considered immaturity in
the U.S. context and vice versa. This is an example of the differing socialization messages that EAA youth are confronted with daily.

The challenge for EAA youth is managing multiple cultural daily demands (Giguère, Lalonde, & Lou, 2011). Although, they are socialized in U.S. cultural norms, and demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the U.S. mainstream culture (Padilla, 2008), they must also be adept in their family’s culture of origin and should adhere to the family’s cultural values and expectations at home. Both the U.S. culture and the East Asian culture generally endorse similar values and beliefs with regards to appropriate daily behaviors (Giguère, Lalonde, & Lou, 2011). Therefore, individuals are not in a frequent state of conflict in their day-to-day functioning. However, when cultural demands are incompatible, adolescents may feel conflicted about what is considered appropriate. Schwartz et al. (2013) noted, “The presence of the heritage culture in the home and of the receiving culture in school and with friends can present identity challenges, especially when these socialization agents are in conflict with each other.” (p. 352). EAA youth use various strategies to resolve these conflicts. Oftentimes, they attempt solutions that meet the demands of both the mainstream and culture of origin settings (Giguère, Lalonde, & Lou, 2010).

Another area where cultural differences become apparent pertains to interpersonal communication (Rhee, Chang, & Rhee, 2003; Santilli & Miller, 2011). The Asian culture is generally characterized by high power-distance and indirect interpersonal communication (Adler, Rosenfeld, & Proctor, 2015). Among EAA, a clear social boundary exists ordered by age, social class, occupation, and gender. Individuals
typically defer to men who are older and/or possess a higher social status. Moreover, indirect communication is preferred over direct forms of communication. Individuals rely on contextual cues (i.e., nonverbal) to understand what the other person is attempting to convey. For example, disagreements are often communicated indirectly in order to not offend or inconvenience others (Park & Kim, 2008).

In contrast, individualist societies, such as the U.S., are characterized by a low power-distance and direct interpersonal style (Rhee et al., 2003). The typical U.S. individual prefers an egalitarian manner of interacting with others, believing that each person is as good as others (Adler, Rosenfeld, & Proctor, 2015). It is also acceptable to challenge or question the status quo directly (Park & Kim, 2008). For example, it is acceptable for students to speak in an informal manner with school teachers, and teachers also encourage open communication with their students. Low power-distance cultures also promote assertiveness (Park & Kim, 2008). Individuals are socialized to speak openly about their needs and communicate how they want their needs to be met. Because each culture emphasizes contrasting interpersonal communication, probability exists for miscommunication. EAA may perceive U.S. Americans as too forward and disrespectful, while U.S. Americans may view EAA as equivocal and subservient (Li, 2011; Rhee et al., 2003).

A second source of stress is related to the history of racial discrimination of EAA immigrants in the U.S. (Zhou & Lee, 2004). In the past, the early East Asian immigrants encountered different forms of racialization perpetrated by members of the U.S. Racialization is the ascription of racial characteristics on an individual or a group of
individuals on the basis of membership in a racial group (Murji & Solomos, 2005). Racial stereotype and discrimination affect EAA well-being negatively (e.g., Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Xia, 2013). While the U.S. has made strides in countering the consequences of racialization, EAA continue to experience the effects (Kiang, Witkow, & Thompson, 2016; Le, 2016).

In the U.S., one of the most pervasive stereotypes of EAA is the model minority stereotype (MMS; Kiang, Witkow, & Thompson, 2016). The MMS was first described in 1960s during the civil rights movement. This stereotype portrayed EAA as the exemplary cultural minority group, who are highly intelligent, submissive, obedient, and self-reliant, and high achievers (Le, 2016; Lim, 2015). On the surface, the MMS appears to laud EAA, however it has several negative consequences.

Research on minority youth development has historically focused on groups with problem behaviors or mental health issues (Zhou & Lee, 2004). However, because EAA youth were viewed as model minorities, they were largely excluded from mental health research until recently (Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2011; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Recent data revealed that EAA may experience similar or even higher levels of psychological problems (Chu & Sue, 2011; Sung, et al., 2013). For example, Yoo, Burrula, and Steger (2010) found that EAA experience numerous culturally-based challenges (e.g., discrimination, parent-child conflicts) which puts them at-risk for negative socioemotional problems. Shih, Todd, Pittinsky, and Ambady (2002) demonstrated that the stereotype of EAA as overachievers creates undue pressure to live up to the unrealistic expectations and lead to distress. Abe-Kim et al. (2007) reported that there is
a general underutilization of mental health services by EAA (8.6%) compared to the
general U.S. population (17.9%). This issue leads to underestimating the prevalence of
mental health issues and subsequently fewer development of mental health resources
for EAA individuals, families, and youth.

While MMS is an attempt to laud EAA abilities to succeed in the U.S., other
minority groups were blamed for not putting forth the same effort to achieve success
(Zhou & Lee, 2004). As Zhou and Lee (2004) noted, the model minority stereotype
perpetuates the false ideal that every individual, regardless of culture or race, has equal
opportunities to attain socioeconomic upward mobility, denying that racism exists. The
result becomes one such that “not only does the image [of MMS] thwart other
racial/ethnic minorities’ demands for social justice, it also pits minority groups against
each other” (Zhou & Lee; p. 18). Today, the MMS continues to exist in subtler forms,
such as unspoken pressure on EAA to achieve academically or financially (Kiang,
Witkow, & Thompson, 2016).

Crockett and Zamboanga (2009) found that children of immigrant families
acculturated faster than their adult caregivers and family members. Because youth
acculturate more quickly than their parents, they are also more fluent in English (Juang
et al., 2012; Xia et al., 2013). Parents, then, may ask their children to be a social and
language broker for the family. For example, children become a translator between the
teacher and the parents at school. In other situations, youth may be expected to take on
adult responsibilities, such as making decisions about financial or medical matters (Yee
et al., 2006). A child may experience intense stress as they carry the responsibility of
caring for the family unit. Moreover, there is a potential for disrupting the power relationship between children and their parents. Wu and Kim (2010) noted in situations where children are relied upon as language broker for the family, there is a role reversal of authority and power.

Another way that acculturation affects a child’s role in the family was observed in EAA families with more than one child. Generally, the oldest child becomes responsible for care taking and disciplining of their younger siblings (Xia et al., 2013). This is especially true when adult caregivers need to work outside the home. Pyke (2005) noted that youth who possess the care taking role, often adhere to the culture of origin values and behaviors. However, it is unknown if this new role has any implications for the development of EAA youth.

**Acculturation dissonance and family conflict.** Acculturation not only affects a person on an individual level, but it also affects the family as a unit. Each family member may acculturate at a different pace, which results in a growing discrepancy in cultural values and practices. This discrepancy is often observed between youth and adults (Berry, 1995), specifically, children acculturate faster than their parents. This is known as *acculturation dissonance* (Lee & Padilla, 2014), which refers to the disparity in cultural frame of references or worldview between individuals. Researchers have found that increasing the dissonance is associated with greater family conflicts (Dinh & Nguyen, 2006; Wu & Chao, 2005; Xia, 2013). In the traditional Korean culture, parents, especially fathers, show less warmth and affection with their children, as they believe that it models emotional restraint and self-control (Chao & Tseng, 2002). However, such
parenting practices appear to be at odds with the Western cultural ideal of what is considered positive parenting practices (Wu & Chao, 2005). This results in EAA youth, who have adopted U.S. ideals, perceiving their parents as cold and distant, and overly concerned about academic and financial success. Because young children acculturate faster than their parents, a discrepancy in values and beliefs develops. Acculturation dissonance appears to be related to many conflicts within EAA families (Lung & Sue, 1997; Wu & Chao, 2011). These cultural conflicts are culturally-based disagreements between family members when they demand each other to conform to their respective cultural worldviews (Wu & Chao, 2005). Juang et al. (2012) postulated that culturally-based conflicts are due to lack of shared cultural understanding between the older and younger family members. One of the consequences of cultural conflicts is the youth feeling less support and love from their parents, and poor communication within the family (Kim, Chen, Li, Huang, & Moon, 2009).

Wu and Chao (2005) illustrated the effects of acculturation dissonance on parent-child relationships and family functioning. Participants consisted of first- and second generation Chinese American ($N = 184$) and European American ($N = 80$) high school students form four different schools in Los Angeles, California. The researchers focused on differences in ideals between adolescents and parents in perceiving parental warmth as indices of acculturation dissonance. Parental warmth was defined as emotional expression (e.g., saying “I love you”), physical expression (e.g., hugging), and open communication. This definition was supported by existing literature, which stated that many EAA youth preferred American parenting practices (e.g., Hyman et al., 2001;
However, first-generation EAA parents prefer to uphold the values and practices of their culture of origin (Koh, 2008). The researchers found no statistical significant difference in ideals for parental warmth for both Chinese American and European American adolescents. However, Chinese American participants reported significantly lower levels of parental warmth than their European American peers \( t(240) = -3.28, p < .001 \). Moreover, Chinese American adolescents reported greater discrepancy between ideals and perception regarding parental warmth \( t(240) = 3.02, p < .001 \). Therefore, both groups of adolescents shared similar ideals of what is considered parental warmth. However, Chinese American participants reported greater discrepancy between ideal warmth and warmth they experience from their parents.

Wu and Chao (2005) hypothesized that Chinese American adolescents who reported receiving less warmth than ideal would have more negative outcomes, but this would not occur for European American adolescents. The negative consequences were internalizing symptoms (e.g., depression and anxiety) and behavioral adjustment problems (e.g., aggression and delinquency). The researchers found that increased dissonance between ideals of parental warmth and perception of warmth (i.e., perceiving less parental warmth than desired) predicted higher reports of internalizing symptoms for Chinese Americans \( b = .28, SE = .08, p < .05 \). However, this relationship was not observed with European Americans \( b = .12, SE = .22, p > .05 \). Conversely, when perceived parental warmth exceeded ideals (i.e., parents perceived as warmer than desired), Chinese Americans reported lower levels of internalizing symptoms \( b = -.85, SE = .38, p < .05 \). This association was not found among
European American adolescents ($b = .53, SE = .35, p > .05$). Additional analysis was conducted to test for generational differences, but the researchers stated that no statistically significant differences were found.

There were two specific areas that warrant further attention in considering the interpretation of Wu and Chao’s (2005) findings. First, the findings suggested that ideals exceeding perceived parental warmth led to adolescents’ problem behaviors, but the researchers did not explore whether a confounding variable could perhaps moderate the direction of causality. An alternative reason for their findings may be that participants’ problem behaviors may have contributed to receiving less parental warmth. Birman (2014) supports the claim of the connection between acculturation dissonance and increased family conflicts; and therefore, lends support to Wu and Chao’s findings.

Second, while the researchers found no significant differences between first- and second-generation youth in regards to ideals of parental warmth, the statistics were not reported in the study. Moreover, generational status was delineated based solely on whether a participant was foreign-born or U.S.-born. Scholars contend that individuals who immigrate after the age 12, continue to have stronger association to their culture of origin (Mena et al., 1987, Rumbaut, 2004). Thus, considering age of immigration may provide further insight about the concept of acculturation gap and its effect on immigrant individuals and families. Nevertheless, the results of Wu and Chao’s (2005) study supported the hypothesis that acculturation dissonance negatively affects EAA families. It also showed that cultural conflicts were linked to negative behavioral outcomes for adolescents.
John Berry’s Acculturation Model. The acculturation process can pose a great challenge to immigrant individuals and families. Over time, they learn to cope and adapt to the acculturation process so that they may reduce the negative effects of the stressors. Berry (1997) proposed a framework which conceptualized the different strategies immigrants use to cope with acculturative stress. These strategies were derived from two basic issues all immigrants contend with, namely a preference for maintaining one’s culture of origin and/or adopting the norms and values of the dominant society (Berry, 2005).

The first issue pertains to the orientation to one’s culture of origin. Maintaining one’s heritage culture depends on two main factors: openness to a new culture and positive interactions with members of the dominant culture. (Berry, 2005). When both elements are present, individuals are more likely to maintain the heritage culture (i.e., high maintenance). If one or both elements are absent, individual may have a low desire to maintain one’s heritage culture (i.e., low maintenance). The second issue is related to the individual’s willingness to accommodate to the mainstream culture and participate in the larger society (Berry, 2005). Immigrants who perceive their culture of origin as compatible with the receiving country’s norms possess a more favorable attitude towards mainstream culture. If these conditions are met, individuals are likely to be open to accommodating to the new norms and values of the dominant culture (i.e., high accommodation). Immigrants who view their culture of origin as incompatible and in stark contrast to the mainstream culture, may resist or reject the influences by the dominant culture (i.e., low accommodation).
Berry (1997; 2005) delineated these dimensions into high and low degrees of maintenance or accommodation, and then crossed them to form his acculturation model (see Figure 2-2). He identified four acculturation strategies in which individuals express how they cope with the acculturative stress: separation, assimilation, integration, and marginalization. An important observation to note is that many researchers often use the term assimilation and acculturation interchangeably. However, Berry (2005) emphasized that acculturation refers to the broader concept of cultural adaptation. On the other hand, assimilation is a specific acculturation strategy in which the immigrant individual loses their loyalty and identity with their culture of origin (Berry, 2005; Carrera, 2013).

Separation (low accommodation, high maintenance) refers to individuals who resist the influence from the host culture. Instead, they choose to maintain their culture of origin’s practices and values (Berry, 1997). Moreover, immigrants may consider their culture incompatible with the norms and values of the dominant society. The separation strategy is often observed among middle to late adult EAA first-generation immigrants who feel strong loyalty towards their culture of origin and low preference in adapting to the new culture (Berry et al., 2006; Padilla, 2008). They may also prefer to live in an ethnic enclave so that they can remain highly involved with their heritage culture without interacting with the larger society.

Assimilation (high accommodation, low maintenance) is characterized by embracing the receiving culture while giving up one’s affiliation with the culture of origin (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993). It also refers to individuals who show greater
endorsement and readily adopt the norms and values of the dominant culture (Berry, 2005). Similar to separationists, assimilated individuals view the two cultures as incompatible, but instead choose to endorse the mainstream culture. In the past, the assimilation strategy was endorsed by the U.S. because many believed that it was the only way for minorities to attain upward socioeconomic mobility (Alba & Nee, 1997; Warner & Srole, 1945). The group of immigrants that benefitted the most from the assimilation strategy were immigrants from Western individualist cultural backgrounds (Warner, Fishbein, & Krebs, 2010).

Individuals who do not feel affiliation to either cultures are considered cultural marginalized, or marginalization (low accommodation and maintenance). They are also known as deculturation or cultural homelessness, refers to (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Rather than calling it a specific acculturation strategy, Berry (1997) postulated that individuals become culturally marginalized because of pressured assimilation, while also becoming excluded by one’s ethnic group. Schwartz et al. (2007) hypothesized that “marginalization may reflect ‘cultural identity confusion’, where the acculturating individual experiences difficulty reconciling the heritage and receiving cultures’ expectations, values, and beliefs and winds up rejecting both” (p. 160).

Marginalization is not well understood because of the lack of empirical studies focusing on this construct. In examining marginalization among EAA families (N = 174) living in the U.S., with most parents in the sample being first-generation immigrant, while the majority (70%) of adolescents were second generation immigrants. Kim, Gonzales, Stroh, and Wang (2006) found that marginalization was significantly related
to depressive symptoms. Thus, this study provided some empirical support for the validity of cultural marginalization.

Integration (high accommodation and maintenance), also known as biculturalism, refers to individuals maintaining their heritage cultural integrity, while accommodating to the dominant cultural norms (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Identification with one culture does not preclude the identification with another. Therefore, an individual may possess strong identification with multiple cultures (Hong et al., 2000; Hong, Zhan, Morris, & Benet-Martínez, 20016). Integrated individuals endorse both cultures and are proficient in the norms of both cultures (Schwartz et al., 2007; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). The concept of integration strategy was derived from the alternation model of second-culture acquisition (LaFromboise et al., 1993), which assumed that an individual is capable of internalizing and alternating between two cultural identities. The individual is adept at alternating his actions and beliefs to fit with the given cultural context (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Integration strategy is often the preferred acculturation strategy by immigrant families (Berry, 2005). However, scholars contend that it is necessary to have a supportive environment of diversity and multiculturalism to facilitate the cultural integration strategy (Berry, 2005; de Anda, 1984).

Enculturation. Heritage culture is often discussed as culture retention for immigrants (e.g., Berry, 1997; Berry, Phinney, Sam & Vedder, 2006 Smokowski, Buchanan & Bacallao, 2009). Unlike their first-generation peers, second and later-generation immigrants may not consider their family’s culture their own culture of origin.
Indeed, second-generation youth are socialized in the mainstream culture through mainstream media, school, and peers. For many cultural minority youth, parents, other family members, and the ethnic community (if available) are the primary source of cultural learning (Kim, 2007; Padilla, 2008). Kim (2007) coined the term *enculturation*, which refers to the process of culture of origin socialization.

Acculturation and enculturation are both process of cultural acquisition. With regards to EAA, acculturation refers to socialization to the U.S. culture, and enculturation is the socialization to the East Asian culture (Kim, 2007). Berry’s model was initially intended to describe the experiences of first- or 1.5-generation immigrants. By conceptualizing the acculturation process as orientation towards culture of origin (maintenance and enculturation) and orientation towards mainstream culture (acculturation), the acculturation model is also applicable to the acculturation experiences of second- or later-generation immigrants.

**Domains of acculturation.** The *Acculturation Model* (Berry, 1997) is fundamental for understanding the acculturation process, and served as a foundation for subsequent research (e.g., Bacallao, & Smokowski, 2005; Cheung, Chudek, & Heine, 2011; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Each individual acculturates in a different manner. Early research focused mainly on behavioral changes over time as an indicator of acculturation (Schwartz et al., 2014). However, acculturation-based behavioral change is only one aspect of acculturation. To fully capture the essence of the acculturation process, scholars proposed that it is important to view change across multiple dimensions. Castillo and Carver (2009) proposed that acculturation occurs
across three independent, domains: (a) values, (b) identification, and (c) practices (See Figure 2-3).

The first cultural domain is values, a cognitive domain, that refers to transcultural values of individualism and collectivism (Triandis, 1995) and group specific values (Schwartz et al., 2014). Examples of EAA group specific values are filial piety, self-restraint, and harmony (Ikels, 2004; Lieber et al., 2006; Ng, 1999). Cultural scholars define individualism and collectivism as two distinct and overarching cultural patterns, reflected in the practices of members from specific countries (Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1998). Each pattern describes a consensus attitude or worldview held by members of each respective society. Characteristics of individualist cultures are independence, self-orientation, and favoring rationale and attitudes (Hsu, 1981). Individualist countries include the U.S., Great Britain, and New Zealand. Collectivist cultures emphasize communal-oriented, focused on the well-being of community, and favoring relatedness, values, and norms (Hsu, 1981). China, Korea, Japan, Dominican Republic, and Mexico are considered collectivist societies. Individualism and collectivism are further delineated into group-specific cultural values. For example, both Latin American and East Asian cultural groups value a family-first orientation (e.g. familism, filial piety). However, a crucial difference is in the manner of caring for the family. For Latino families, caring for family is implied, but for East Asian families, the expectation to obey and care for family members is explicit (Ruiz, 2006). In general, research findings supported the value differences between individualist and collectivists societies (e.g. Hui & Triandis, 1986; Singh, 1962). Triandis, McCusker, and
Hui (1990) found that cultural differences have implications for individuals’ worldviews and beliefs.

The second cultural domain is identification. Whereas Phinney’s (1992) concept of ethnic identity emphasizes an individual’s sense of belonging to ethnic-racial groups within a given society, culture identification emphasizes the individual’s subjective sense of belonging and strong affective connection with one’s culture of origin (e.g., Chinese, Korean, Colombian), which includes feeling of attachment and sense of pride one has as a member of their cultural group (Castillo & Cavers, 2009; Schwartz et al., 2014; Suinn, Ahuna, & Koo, 1992). In essence, individuals may define themselves in terms of which cultural group to identify with, whether it is mainstream, culture of origin, or both – such as “Chinese”, “American”, or “Chinese American”. Thus, the individual may feel a sense of solidarity with more than shared traits (e.g., language, appearances), but includes history, ideology, and traditions (Schildkraut, 2007).

The third cultural domain relates to culture-specific practices and behaviors. This domain emphasized changes of cultural practices as indicators of acculturation in immigrants, such as language and food preferences, or participating in cultural practices and events (Schwartz, Vignoles, Brown, & Zagefka, 2014). Researchers have often focused on the changes in behaviors over time to as markers of cultural adaptation (e.g., Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004; Phinney, 1990; Suinn-Lew, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992). For example, the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation assesses respondent’s self-report of the frequency and degree of involvement in cultural practices (e.g., “What language do you prefer?”). Cultural practices may have important implications for
maintaining cultural integrity. Cultural practices can also increase frequency of interactions with members of that cultural group, as well as enhance positive relations (LaFromboise et al., 1993). For example, EAA oriented towards their East Asian culture of origin prefer to communicate in their native language. Whereas those who prefer the mainstream U.S. culture, communicate primarily in American English. Among the cultural practices, language has a significant role in shaping one’s cultural identity (Kouhpaenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014).

The role of language is often overlooked when considering youth identity development (Norton, 2000). As the U.S. has become an increasingly diverse and multilingual society, research on the interplay between language and identity is important (Marcrum, 2007). In recent years, scholars posited the role of language in identity development (Lee, 2002; Marcrum, 2007; Norton, 2000; Shin, 2016). Marcrum (2007) argued that language proficiency is interconnected with an individual’s culture and identity because it allows the individual to participate in his cultural context; language is the lens through which an individual interprets self, others, and the world. Mercuri (2012) stated that “culture reflects the totality of our being, our values, and our beliefs. It is the foundation of each specific values and beliefs from previous generation and will pass them on to the subsequent ones.” (pp. 14). With regards to identity development, adolescents who are proficient in more than one language have a wider range for exploring different values and beliefs, as well as greater interaction with different cultural groups. Conversely, minority individuals who lose fluency in their
heritage culture, as they often do with each subsequent generation, also decrease in
ethnic loyalty and a weakened connection to one’s culture of origin (Padilla, 2006).

Each cultural domain is independent of one another, but related (Portes &
Rumbaut, 2001; Schwartz et al., 2010). Acculturation changes may occur in one
domain, but not in another. For example, an EAA individual lacking competency in his
native language or other cultural practices, may still identify strongly with his East Asian
heritage. The changes in each domain depends not only on an individual’s preference
of cultural orientation (i.e., acculturation strategy), but on other factors as well, such as
society’s attitude towards cultural pluralism, the history of the relationship between the
cultural group and the larger society, and level of exposure to multicultural groups
(Berry, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2013).

Acculturation does not only affect first-generation immigrants, but also the
children of immigrant families (Greenman & Xie, 2006; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011;
Schwartz et al., 2013; 2014). Adolescents, in particular, are at a vulnerable period
where cultural identity becomes a significant part of their self-concept (Umaña-Taylor et
al., 2014). The interplay between identity and cultures also directly influences their well-
being (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Yet, research on the experiences of EAA youth
culture and identity development remains scarce (Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2011).

**Cultural Identity and Well-Being**

Acculturation affects multiple areas of the lives of immigrant families, including
well-being and adjustment (e.g., Juang et al., 2012; Lee & Padilla, 2014; Schwartz et
al., 2015). Scholars hypothesized that cultural adaptation strategies, based on Berry’s
(1997) model, were related to psychosocial outcomes (Smokowksi & Bacallao, 2011).
Research on children of immigrant families in the U.S. showed both positive and negative health and behavioral outcomes. However, researchers noted that children of immigrant families are likely to experience poverty, live in poorer neighborhoods, and thereby exposed to various negative outcomes (Portes, Fernandez-Kelley, & Haller, 2005; Rumbaut 2005). For example, researchers found that many children of immigrants are at an increased risk of engaging in illegal and delinquent behaviors (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Hunt, Moloney, & Evans, 2011), or dropping out of school (Hirschman, 2001). Other researchers (Greenman & Xie, 2006; Rumbaut, 1997) found that children of immigrant families demonstrated high level of resiliency and strong work ethic in succeeding academically. Thus, scholars considered it important to identify the role of acculturation in shaping the positive or negative experiences of children of immigrant families.

Acculturation also affects the identity development process of immigrant children. Youth are confronted with many culturally-based challenges that they must resolve in order to achieve a sense of identity (Schwartz et al., 2009; 2015b; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Padilla (2008) noted that youth “may receive messages about one identity from their immediate family [grandparents and parents], another from teachers, a third identity from peers, and still a fourth from official governmental sources or the media.” (p. 22). This is the experience of EAA youth affected by acculturation. Similar to adult immigrants, adolescents cope with the culturally-based challenges using the acculturation strategies as outlined in Berry’s (1997; 2005) model.
Acculturation research suggests that marginalization was associated with negative psychosocial outcomes, such as substance abuse, depression, anxiety, familial isolation, and low self-esteem (Berry, 2005; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009). Separation was associated with high levels of ethnic pride and family cohesion, but also high levels of social isolation, anxiety, and depression (Berry, 2005; Nguyen, Messé, & Sotllak, 1999). Research findings for both assimilation and integration with regards to individual well-being were less conclusive.

**Assimilation or Integration**

In general, research has shown that assimilation and integration are associated with better physical and psychological outcomes compared to separation or marginalization (Berry, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2015). Nguyen, Messé, and Stollak (1999) examined the link between acculturation and adjustment in 182 Vietnamese youth living in the U.S. The researchers measured levels of involvement with the Vietnamese culture and U.S. culture, and their correlation with overall adjustments – as measured across intrapersonal outcomes (i.e., distress, depression), interpersonal adjustment (i.e., family and peer relationships), and academic achievements. They found that youth’s high levels of involvement with U.S. culture was associated with positive outcomes across all three adjustment domains (Nguyen, Messé, & Sotllak, 1999). While high levels of involvement with Vietnamese predicted negative mental health adjustments (i.e., higher levels of distress), it also predicted positive family relationships. Nguyen and colleagues (1999) concluded that assimilation led to better adjustment for Vietnamese youth. Therefore, assimilation and integration are considered adaptive acculturation strategies, as both approaches promote some level of accommodation.
with the mainstream culture. However, there is considerable disagreement on how U.S.
immigrants should acculturate (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011).

Assimilation theorists argue that immigrants should abandon their ethnic
identities in order to become more Americanized. Specifically, some scholars reported
that assimilated immigrants experienced less social isolation and depression, while
developing a strong loyalty to the U.S. (Chun, Organista, & Marin, 2003; LaFromboise
et al., 1993). In contrast, proponents of integration strategies, argue that there is value
in maintaining the culture of origin, while also adapting to the mainstream culture
(Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2006). Alternation theorists contend that
high levels of assimilation may lead to negative health behaviors and mental health
difficulties for immigrant youth (Schwartz, 2010; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011), contrary
to the assertion of assimilation theorists. However, additional research is needed to
further examine both theories.

Reconsidering Assimilation Theory.

When acculturation theorists focused on specific cultural groups, they
reconsidered assimilation as an adaptive form of cultural adaptation (Rudmin, 2003;
Schwartz et al., 2010). Most research supporting assimilation was primarily derived from
the experiences of European immigrants (Schwartz et al., 2010; Warner et al., 2010).
Since immigrants from Westernized societies (e.g. Germany, United Kingdom, New
Zealand) share similar cultural values with those promoted in the U.S., it is conceivable
that this immigrant group would experience fewer difficulties assimilating to the norms of
the U.S. society (de Anda, 1984). However, most contemporary immigrants come from
Latin America or Asia; and therefore, the assimilation theory does not apply to these
immigrants (Feliciano, 2001; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). In fact, new research found that cultural assimilation may be linked to poorer outcomes for specific immigrant groups (Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000; Gonzales, Knight, Morgan-Lopez, Saenz, & Sirolli, 2002; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009).

In examining assimilation among Latino immigrant youth \(N = 88\), Smokowski and Bacallao (2011) found two primary mechanisms which compel immigrant adolescents to assimilate to the U.S. culture: language and discrimination. First, ensuring a stable future for their children is paramount for many immigrant parents (Ng, 1999). Additionally, children also experience discrimination or teasing for speaking any languages other than English at school (Smolen & Oswald, 2011). Therefore, immigrant parents encourage their children to learn English quickly in order to attain success in school or work (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). However, the consequence becomes one in which children perceive the English language as privileged, while their home language is viewed as inferior (Bourdieu, 1977). In losing their fluency of their heritage language, children may find it more difficult to understand the nuances of their culture of origin, which affects one’s cultural identity (Padilla, 2008). For example, parents may no longer connect with their children around meaningful cultural themes, share family history, or transmit cultural ideas and values. Thus, adolescents may have a diminished sense of connection with their cultural group.

Discrimination is the second factor that pressures immigrant youth in using the assimilation strategy (Alderete et al., 1999). Latino adolescents who were discriminated against, at school or in the community, reported feeling anxiety, fear, and being
excluded. They believed that assimilating with the U.S. norms would lessen discriminatory attacks (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Moreover, adolescents believe that adopting U.S. norms and values would help form relationships with U.S. American peers and participate in the larger society.

In the U.S., assimilation theory continues to be promoted as an integral part for immigrants to achieve upward social mobility and better mental health outcomes (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Schools is one such arena in which the immigrant youth feels pressured to assimilate with the U.S. culture (Smokowski and Bacallao, 2011). In 2000, the state of Arizona passed a school policy declaring that all curriculums should be solely taught in English. At the same time opportunities for bilingual instructions were discouraged (Arizona Proposition, 2000). The underlying message of assimilation in the U.S. is to regard the dominant culture as more desirable, while one’s culture of origin is unwanted or considered inferior, a subtle form of racial discrimination (Schwartz et al., 2010).

As previously stated, assimilation may be linked to negative well-being for immigrants from non-Western cultures. The EAA youth may be considered one such group that does not benefit from cultural assimilation for several reasons. First, scholars noted that EAA experience exclusion from fully identifying as a U.S. American due to their physical appearance as markedly different from those of Euro-Americans (Lee & Mock, 2005; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Indeed, many second-generation EAA, who were socialized and identify with the U.S. culture, reported that they would never feel accepted as American, but rather a “forever foreigner” (Zhou, 2004). At the same time,
second-generation youth may also experience discrimination by members of the cultural community because they have not retained much of their cultural practices or values (Pyke & Dang, 2003). As such, the potential exists for EAA youth to feel rejected by both communities and they become at-risk for cultural marginalization. Second, study findings indicated an association of high levels of assimilation with negative mental health outcomes among Latino and EAA children, such as illicit drug use and abuse (Martinez, 2006; Masel, Rudkin, & Peek, 2006), depression (Hunt et al., 2011), and increased parent-child conflicts (Wu & Chao, 2011). Martinez (2006) examined levels of acculturation, acculturative stress, and parent-child relationship as predictors of youth substance abuse among recent immigrant Latino families ($N = 73$) with middle school-aged children. The researchers assessed the family’s level of functioning (as measured by self-report of parent-child relationship), cultural preferences (i.e. heritage culture orientation or mainstream culture orientation), and substance use by youth (youth self-report of tobacco and alcohol use) and found that higher levels of acculturation predicted a poorer parent-child relationship, which in turn was associated with a higher likelihood of youth substance use. Thus, cultural assimilation appears to be associated with negative outcomes for EAA youth.

**Integration as the preferred acculturation strategy.**

Since assimilation does not appear to be a viable acculturation strategy, alternation theory might be more appropriate for immigrants from non-Western cultures. LaFromboise and colleagues (1993) contended that individuals using the integration strategy demonstrate cultural competence in both cultures. They outlined the following criteria as important aspects in being culturally competent: (a) having a strong personal
identity, (b) possessing knowledge of the beliefs and values of the culture, (c) being sensitive to the affective processes of the culture, (d) being able to communicate in the language of the cultural group, (e) demonstrating socially appropriate behaviors, (f) interacting within the cultural group, and (g) functioning within the institutional structure of a culture (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Therefore, a bicultural competent individual, as a result of living in two cultures, demonstrates these criteria for both the receiving and heritage cultures. Additionally, biculturalism assumes that culture is not monolithic. Bicultural individuals internalize their heritage and receiving cultures, and are able to access the resources from both in guiding their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Schwartz & Unger, 2010). They can proficiently operate between the two cultural systems, modifying their behaviors and thoughts appropriately according to the cultural task, without compromising their sense of cultural identity. Cultural researchers also reported that individuals who view the two (or more) cultural streams as compatible and integrate both cultures, demonstrate emotional stability, openness to new experiences, and advanced cognitive reasoning (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Tadmore & Tetlock, 2006).

**Bicultural Identity Development**

Bicultural identity, or biculturalism, is the integration of values, identity, and behaviors of two (or more) cultures by an individual. The individual can identify with multiple culture of origins (e.g., a Chinese who was born and raised in Suriname), while also adopting a second culture. The concept of biculturalism can be extended to include the process of integrating multiple cultural identities (Schwartz et al., 2016; Hong et al.,
2016). The current study focused on individuals who integrated at least one culture of origin with one receiving culture.

Bicultural identity development research provides a basis for understanding how individuals negotiate between different cultural identities (Hong et al., 2016). Researchers reported that biculturals have internalized at least two cultural identities, namely their culture of origin and the mainstream culture (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002). These cultural identities, based on a set of shared norms, serve to guide biculturals to respond (cognitively, emotionally, or behaviorally) appropriately to their context (Giguère, Lalonde, & Lou, 2010).

EAA biculturals have internalized at least two cultural identities, their East Asian identity and their U.S. American identity, and they manage these identities according to the social context or task (Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002). For example, a Chinese adolescent uses a high-context communication style with Asian adults, but switches to a low-context communication style with American adults. Researchers further claimed that individuals with a strong bicultural identity can cope with culturally-based conflicts effectively (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Tadmore and Tetlock (2006) stated “individuals who cope with social and cultural conflict situations by internalizing the values of both groups (i.e., become bicultural) will respond in reliably more complex ways than those who choose to adhere to the values of only one cultural group” (pp. 174 - 175). Biculturals have a better ability to understand and bridge other cultures, are adaptable and flexible, and are able to develop relationship building skills better than those who are considered monocultural (Thomas, Brennan, & Garcia, 2010).
Thus, biculturalism can serve as protective factor against the negative effects of acculturative stress and racial discrimination.

Ahn, Kim, and Park (2008) investigated how bicultural Korean American college students ($N = 115$) responded to culturally-based stressors. The researchers hypothesized that biculturalism (as measured by levels of acculturation) moderated the relationship between perceived acculturation gap and coping strategies and that cognitive complexity was a marker of biculturalism. The researchers found that the perceived acculturation gap between participants and their parents was positively correlated with an increase in perceived intensity of family conflicts. As the perception of discrepancy in cultural values increased, family conflicts became more frequent and intense. However, a complex cognitive ability moderated the intensity of family conflicts (father-child values gap, $\beta = 0.45$, $p < .01$; mother-child values gap; $\beta = 0.41$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, the results indicated that participants with a higher score of cognitive complexity relied on adaptive coping strategies (i.e., problem solving, seeking social support), whereas those who scored low on cognitive complexity adopted the avoidance strategy in addressing family conflicts. This study empirically supported the hypothesis of biculturalism as a protective factor in the context parent-child relationship. A limitation to Ahn and colleague’s (2008) study, was that the researchers did not describe how participants fostered cognitive complexity, but instead presumed that participants possessed this ability because they were biculturals.

Haritatos and Martinez (2002) also hypothesized that cognitive flexibility may develop during adolescence (i.e., identity formation); however, this idea remains
theoretical. Scholars may expand upon this research by studying bicultural identity
during adolescence. In doing so, researchers may be able to identify which elements
can facilitate or hinder the development of cognitive flexibility. Due to the increasing
interest in bicultural identity development in the last few decades, professionals have
attempted to develop prevention and intervention programs to promote biculturalism.

**Acculturation-Based Intervention Programs**

**Social skills training**

Bicultural skills programs aimed at promoting biculturalism evolved from three
training programs. The first intervention program, proposed by LaFromboise and Rowe
(1983), focused on teaching assertiveness skills to Native American adults, known as
the social skills training (SST) model. The goal of this intervention was to teach
participants communication skills, assertiveness skills, and strategies for resisting
assimilation pressure (LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983). Participants would develop
discretionary skills to understand how to demonstrate assertiveness appropriately in
both Native American and non-Native American cultures. The SST model was later
empirically tested by Schinke et al. (1988) in his work with Native American adolescents
at risk for substance abuse. Schinke et al. (1988) randomly assigned 137 participants to
the bicultural intervention training group or control group, then compared their
performances on measures of knowledge and attitudes towards drugs and alcohol.
Participants in the intervention group performed significantly better than those in the
control group. At a six-month follow-up, the intervention group also reported lower rates
of alcohol, drugs, and tobacco use.
Hero/heroine modeling

Malgady, Rogler, and Costantino (1990) developed a bicultural skills program, entitled Hero/Heroine Modeling. The Hero/Heroine program aimed to promote adaptive behaviors in middle-school Puerto Rican students through stories of ethnic and bicultural role models (Malgady et al., 1990). Ninety children in the eighth and ninth grades were randomly assigned to either the Hero/Heroine intervention group or control group. The researchers found that children in the intervention group scored lower on measures of anxiety and higher on measures of ethnic identity and self-concept compared with children in the control group.

Bicultural effectiveness training

The third bicultural skills training program, developed by Szapocznik et al. (1984), was known as the Bicultural Effectiveness Training (BET) family intervention model. The focus of BET was to reduce intergenerational and intercultural conflicts between immigrant delinquent youth and their parents, while also helping the family cope with acculturation issues. Using psychoeducational lessons, the therapist helped the family to create a shared worldview and reframed family problems as cultural differences that interfered with family interactions (Szapocznik et al., 1984). The BET model consisted of 12 lessons that occur across three distinct phases. During phase one (lesson 1 – 4), the family is introduced to the concepts of culture, acculturation, biculturalism, and family development in regards to acculturation. During the next phase (lesson 5 – 9), the counselor uses Structural Family Therapy techniques to shift the family’s view of intergenerational differences into a view of cultural differences. In the third phase (lesson 10 – 12), the counselor focuses on strengthening the family’s
alliance through a review of the strategies they learned in the previous phases. The BET was specifically designed as an intervention in working with Latino immigrant adolescents, with a history of delinquency, and their families. The BET model was compared to Brief Structural Family Therapy (BSFT) on measures of reducing family conflict and improving family functioning (Szapocznik et al., 1986). Cuban American families experiencing intercultural and intergenerational difficulties who had an adolescent with a history of delinquent behavior were invited to participate in the study. Participants were randomly assigned to the BET intervention \((n = 50)\) or the BSFT treatment \((n = 50)\). The researchers found that BET was as effective as BSFT in improving family functioning, while reducing adolescent problem behaviors; however, only BET increased levels of endorsement of cultural values, behaviors, and attitudes of two cultures (i.e., biculturalism).

The results of the early acculturation-based intervention models suggested that bicultural skills training programs were better than no interventions or alternative interventions on outcomes such as depression, anxiety, substance use, and conduct problems (Bacallao, & Smokowski, 2005; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). In spite of these early promising results, few of the studies progressed beyond the pilot testing stage of program development. There were also no replication studies conducted in diverse settings to substantiate the viability of these programs (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2005; 2011). The lack of a standard set of outcomes further complicated evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs. These complications stalled the advancement in
Entre Dos Mundos/Between two worlds

Inspired by past bicultural programs, Smokowski and Bacallao (2011) wanted to advance the research in bicultural identity development. The researchers also aimed to address the shortcomings of past programs and establish standards for future research. Smokowski and Bacallao (2005; 2009; 2011) developed the program Entre Dos Mundos (EDM), which was designed to prevent future violence through the promotion of biculturalism. Smokowski and Bacallao (2005) proposed that fostering biculturalism in Latino immigrant youth would lead to better overall well-being and a decrease in parent-adolescent conflicts. The EDM project encompassed weekly meetings involving eight to ten adolescents and their parents. During the sessions, the families and their children discussed their acculturation challenges and built a social support network with each other. The multi-family format was also selected to promote parent-child interactions, support learning from other families who share similar challenges, and address a range of mental health problems (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Each session focused on a specific theme that was related to acculturation stress, such as coping with racial discrimination, cultural conflicts in family, and challenges Latino immigrant children experience in U.S. schools (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Smokowski and Bacallao (2011) hypothesized that engaging participants, through experiential learning and practicing new behaviors within a supportive group environment, would increase bicultural competence. Each session began with a visual representation to depict the circular acculturation relationships of heritage culture and host culture (see Figure 2-4).
A large cutout or drawing of the circle was placed on the floor of the meeting area. The group facilitator explained that acculturation is a dynamic process of moving between the two cultural identities in a cyclical manner (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Parents and adolescents physically stood on the acculturation circle to indicate where they perceived themselves to be in the bicultural development process. Together, they discussed why they chose the part of the circle.

In the next part, the facilitator challenged the participants to discuss and address the cultural challenges they were experiencing. In accordance with the session theme, (e.g., discrimination, parent-child conflict, language barrier) the facilitator selected a scenario, then participants worked together to solve the presented issue. This activity encouraged catharsis, promoted insight, and taught bicultural skills (e.g. frame-switching, communication). At the conclusion of the session, participants stood on the circular model again to provide closure and track any changes in their acculturation process. In using these activities, the facilitator focused on the importance for immigrant youth to develop a bicultural identity in order to effectively navigate through the cultural challenges within their environment, with an emphasis on the role of parental support (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Smokowski, &Bacallao, 2005).

Bacallao and Smokowski (2009) examined the effectiveness of EDM with Latino families with a foreign-born adolescent between 12 and 18 years of age, with at least one parent in each session. Eighty-one families were randomly assigned to the action-oriented bicultural skills training condition or an unstructured support condition as the comparison group. Participants in the unstructured support group received identical
session themes without the experiential activities. The results of the study indicated that participants in both conditions decreased in family conflicts and increased family cohesion at posttest. Parents also reported significantly lower levels of externalizing and internalizing behaviors in their adolescent children. However, only participants in the action-oriented training reported sustained improvements (i.e., fewer family conflicts, improved self-esteem, and fewer reports of internalizing symptoms) at one-year follow-up (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009).

The findings from the EDM project (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011) greatly contribute to the understanding of the bicultural development experiences of immigrant adolescents. It also provided implications for practice in fostering biculturalism in Latino youth. More importantly, EDM was the first bicultural skills training program that was empirically tested for its effectiveness in reducing the negative effects of acculturation, while promoting healthy family relations and well-being. The researchers reported that the key to fostering a positive outcome for immigrant youth was in the development of bicultural identity integration (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011).

**Considerations in Developing a Bicultural Identity**

Becoming bicultural and maintaining connections with two distinct cultural identities is potentially challenging and distressing for the immigrant individual (Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002; Schwartz et al., 2006). Indeed, Schwartz and Unger (2010) posited that certain environmental factors must be present in order for immigrant youth to develop a bicultural identity. Schwartz & Unger (2010) noted, “When the individual is embedded in a community that integrates the heritage and receiving cultural streams, and where comfort with both cultures is essential for day-to-day living, then biculturalism
is most likely to emerge.” (p. 27). Rudmin (2003) questioned whether biculturalism is desirable for all ethnic immigrants, especially for those who live in communities where there is little or no support for expressing one’s culture of origin.

Scholars have also suggested that biculturalism can be expressed in multiple ways (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). The first type of biculturalism refers to individuals who combine cultural elements from both cultures, creating a new blended identity in which they fluidly move between their cultural identities (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). The second form of biculturalism refers to individuals who alternate between one or the other cultural identity depending on the context or situation (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). In both instances, the individual is proficient in both the culture of origin and the mainstream culture. The distinction between blended and alternating biculturals is primarily concerned with a person’s social cognitive structure (Kankesan, 2010). Blended biculturals view both of their cultures as connected within one social cognitive structure, while biculturals with alternating identities view their cultural identities as two (or multiple) separate frames or scripts (Kankesan, 2010). Preliminary study findings suggested that blended biculturals are associated with better outcomes than those who view their two cultural identities as incompatible (Hong et al., 2000). However, continued research is necessary in this area.

Research on the relationship between cultural identity and well-being is still in its early phases (Schwartz et al., 2013; Schwartz, Benet-Martínez, & Unger, 2016). Theoretically speaking, since personal identity and cultural identity are intertwined - because cultural orientations influence personal goals, values and beliefs - it is
expected that cultural identity will predict mental health well-being. Yet, the few empirical studies published showed inconclusive results concerning this relationship (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Weisskirch, & Rodriguez, 2009). There is a need for further research that focuses on examining the intersection of personal and cultural identity in adolescence, in order to discover the specific components of cultural identity and its possible relationship to well-being. Nevertheless, there is reason for optimism in the viability of biculturalism in the U.S., as the current socio-political climate appears to be changing towards acceptance of multiculturalism. From a theoretical standpoint, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) argued that developing a bicultural identity is still the most advantageous acculturation strategy for children of immigrant families.

Children who learn the language and culture of their new country without losing those of the old have a much better understanding of their place in the world. They are able to bridge the gap across generations and value of their elders’ traditions and goals while minimizing dissonance with their parents and reducing embarrassment. Selective acculturation forges an intergenerational alliance for successful adaptation that is absent among youth who have severed bonds with their past in the pursuit of acceptance by their native peers. (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 274)

The change in U.S. attitudes towards immigrants may be slow, but it is encouraging to see a more supportive environment for bilingualism and bicultural practices in the U.S. Moreover, the advances in technology and communication has allowed youth and families to stay connected with their culture of origin (Arnett 2002; Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). Social media and the internet are ways to stay in touch with the
latest trends around the world. While there are still barriers to biculturalism, furthering bicultural research can be pivotal in finding ways to facilitate an environment that supports bicultural identity development.

**Bicultural Development and EAA Youth**

East Asian American youth must balance East Asian Confucian influences while finding ways to succeed as a member in the Western individualist culture. Due to the rapid growth of the ethnic minority population in the U.S., cultural identity and acculturation studies have become increasingly important (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015). However, gaps in the literature exist in our understanding of the intersection of Asian American youth, identity development, biculturalism, and mental health (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006; Zhou & Lee, 2004). Thus far, theorists asserted that it is important to cultivate a bicultural identity as a way of promoting positive well-being, but the mechanism of bicultural development is not well understood (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2007; 2015). Consistent with Erikson’s (1956) writing of adolescence as a critical developmental period, Cheung, Chudek, and Heine (2011) posited that early adolescence is a sensitive period for acculturation, and thus, an important period for developing a bicultural identity. In their study of Hong Kong immigrants who resided in Canada (N = 232; 141 females, 91 males), Cheung and colleagues (2011) found that participants who immigrated at an early age (i.e., before 14.5 years old) were more likely to experience an increased level in identification with the Canadian culture as they become older. In contrast, participants who immigrated at a later age were less likely to identify as Canadians. This study highlighted the importance of setting a positive foundation for bicultural identity development during the
adolescent years for ethnic minority youth. Despite the efforts to promote cultural identity, research in EAA youth acculturation and well-being is lacking.

Chapter Summary

Bicultural identity development research in the cultural literature has gained attention over the last decade. Despite promising early findings of bicultural skill training programs (e.g., Entre dos Mundos), it is still difficult to generalize the results due to the lack of replication studies to validate the theory of biculturalism (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). In order to advance the area of biculturalism, identity, and development of intervention research, scholars need to continue efforts to refine and replicate bicultural studies. According to identity theorists, identity development begins in adolescence coinciding with the development of formal cognitive capabilities (Côté & Levine, 1987; Erikson, 1956, 1968). Cultural identity is a dimension of identity because culture orientation guides life goals, values, and beliefs (Schwartz et al., 2013). Asian American youth experience the challenge of navigating between two (or more) cultural systems with conflicting socialization agents. There is some evidence that individuals who successfully integrate both cultures (i.e., bicultural identity) demonstrate overall positive well-being (Fuligni & Tsai, 2015; Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011) and that a cultural identity serves as a protective factor against behavior problems and unsafe behaviors later in life (Feliciano, 2001; Liu et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2012). In light of these findings, researchers and practitioners need strategies for encouraging Asian American youth to actively develop their identity, particularly an identity where they view both cultures as compatible, rather than conflictual.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Psychosocial Crisis</th>
<th>Basic Virtue</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trust vs. Mistrust</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Infancy 0 to ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Autonomy vs. Shame</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Early Childhood (1½ to 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initiative vs. Guilt</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Play age (3 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industry vs. Inferiority</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>School age (5 to 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ego identity vs. Role confusion</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Adolescence (12 to 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Young Adult (18 to 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Generativity vs. Stagnation</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Adulthood (40 to 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ego Integrity vs. Despair</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Maturity (65+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-1. Marcia (1966) Identity Achievement Statuses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Participation</th>
<th>Cultural Maintenance</th>
<th>Cultural Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-2. Berry (1996). Acculturation model.
Figure 2-3. Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik (2010). Multidimensionality of Acculturation.
Figure 2-4. Smokowski & Bacallao’s (2011) Circular model of bicultural development
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology used to investigate the relationship between bicultural identity and well-being among EAA youth through examining the effectiveness of a bicultural skills training intervention to increase bicultural competence in EAA youth. The following topics are addressed in this chapter: (a) sample, (b) study design, (c) overview of the intervention, (d) procedures, (e) context and settings, (f) treatment fidelity, (g) instruments, (h) research hypothesis, and (i) data analysis. The author also discusses the ethical considerations for the project.

Sample

The sample consisted of EAA adolescents between the ages of 12 to 18 years old who were 1.5 or second-generation immigrants from East Asian immigrant families. They were also required to have lived in the U.S. and attended a U.S. school for a minimal of one year. Additionally, participants needed to be able to read and understand English at the middle school level because the intervention and assessments were conducted in English. The researcher recruited participants from three Asian ethnic churches from different cities in Florida. A total of 62 adolescents were enrolled in the study.

Study Design

The author used a quasi-experimental design to examine the effectiveness of the bicultural skills training intervention aimed to increase bicultural knowledge and skills in EAA youth. An experimental design is considered the best method for finding causal inferences between the predictor variables and outcome variables (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). It was not feasible to randomly assign participants in the current
study for several reasons. First, the researcher lacks control over the assignment to
treatment or comparison conditions. The site hosts would not have agreed to the study
if some individuals were included while others were excluded from the intervention.
Second, the site hosts gave a limited period and specific days for the researcher to
implement the intervention. In considering the given time frame and the available
resources (e.g., researcher traveling cost), random assignment of the groups would not
have been possible. Therefore, the researcher chose a quasi-experimental design for
this study. The researcher would compare the pretest scores of both groups to
determine whether both groups share similar characteristics.

East West Connection: A Bicultural Intervention

The bicultural skills training curriculum, entitled East West Connection, was a
four-week intervention program for EAA adolescents that encompassed group
discussions and activities. Each 90-minute session focused on a specific theme related
to EAA acculturation experiences (see Table 3-1). The themes were guided by the
research literature on acculturation theory (Berry, 2005), EAA cultural protective factors
(Yeh, et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2012), and bicultural identity development theory
(Haritatos & Benet-Martínez, 2002; LaFromboise et al., 1997). As illustrated in Figure 3-1,
the purpose of the East West Connection is to mediate the negative effect of
acculturation stressors by increasing the bicultural competence of EAA youth.

The intervention first focused on building cultural knowledge. Participants
developed foundational knowledge of both U.S. American and Asian cultures. This
included learning about the socio-historical context of EAA in the U.S. Participants also
learned to compare and contrast cultural values and beliefs of both cultures. Equally as
important as cultural knowledge is knowing the appropriate behaviors to operate in both
cultural contexts. Therefore, participants also learned about behaviors that are associated with cultural values and beliefs. For example, being assertive and independent are likely viewed favorably by members of the U.S. culture, but not by EAA. The East West Connection included experiential activities to transform bicultural knowledge into awareness and skills. Experiential learning is defined as learning through cooperative and goal-directed activities that engage learners cognitively and behaviorally. This is the preferred method for youth to acquire new skills and knowledge (Hamilton, 1980). The key factor in experiential learning is the conscious “attention to the conditions under which experiences is educational” (Hamilton, 1989; p. 180). The selected activities for the East West Connection include role plays, case studies, think-pair-share, and other activities designed to build bicultural skills (e.g., interpersonal communication style, coping with acculturation stress, problem-solving). Group discussions focused on increasing social support among participants. Through sharing about their acculturative challenges and developing solutions together, participants became sources of support for each other. It is crucial to create an emotionally safe environment within the group to increase supportive between members. See Appendix C for the curriculum manual.

**Procedures**

After receiving approval from the institutional review board (IRB) at the University of Florida, the author contacted churches in different cities across Florida and requested permission to conduct the intervention. The author explained the purpose of the study, and enlisted help from the leaders of the churches to recruit participants. After the leaders agreed to allow the author to conduct the study at their locations, the author organized a meeting with the parents/caregivers to describe the purpose of the study,
provide an overview of the curriculum, and discuss the consent process. Caregivers received the informed consent form, which included a detailed description of the study, procedures, potential risks and benefits, participant confidentiality and limits of confidentiality, and the researcher’s contact information (See Appendix A). The researcher also offered the option to have the informed consent verbally translated, by a bilingual member of the church. No caregivers requested translation, but a few did speak privately with the researcher for clarification about the study. Adolescents also provided assent prior to the first session. The researcher read the minor assent script (See Appendix B for script) to the participants and ensured that they understood the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of the study, and group confidentiality. Participants who declined to participate were excused from the study.

Participants in the treatment group completed the pretest, participated in the intervention, and completed the posttest. Participants in the comparison group completed the pre- and posttest, but did not participate in the intervention. The researcher administered and collected the assessments before the first session and after the last session.

**Setting and Context**

The study consisted of three groups, two were assigned to the treatment condition and one was assigned to the delayed-treatment condition. The researcher conducted the intervention in the churches of each respective youth group. The facility included a space where participants could be seated comfortably and participate in group activities.

East Asian ethnic churches often serve as a pivotal social institution for many first-generation immigrant families (Kim, 2004). Ethnic religious organizations are one of
the few settings where immigrant families can engage in their familiar cultural practices (e.g., conversing in Chinese) while adapting to the mainstream culture (Choi et al., 2014). This is especially important for immigrant families who live in nontraditional immigrant communities, neighborhoods or cities with a relatively small concentration of EAA members (Marotta & García, 2003). For example, EAA youth access their EAA cultural norms when interacting with less acculturated church members, such as elderly or recent immigrants. When talking to more acculturated church members, they would often behave in ways that are consistent with the U.S. American norms. Thus, the Asian ethnic church was an ideal setting for implementing the proposed curriculum.

**Treatment Fidelity**

The researcher used the curriculum with two different groups; and therefore, the researcher took steps to ensure treatment fidelity across the groups. The author developed a treatment manual to ensure that group facilitators followed the same protocol (see Appendix C). The manual provided information about the lesson plans, discussion topics, and instructions for activities for each lesson. Initially, the researcher had planned to train group facilitators to implement the curriculum. However, due to time constraints and difficulty identifying a time to train group facilitators, the author instead chose a co-facilitator model, in which the researcher conducted the sessions with a second facilitator. The co-facilitators received a copy of the manual, and the author met with the co-facilitators, before and after each session, to debrief and discuss the session content and activities.
Instruments

Bicultural Self-Efficacy Scale

The researcher measured the participants’ bicultural competence using the Bicultural Self-Efficacy Scale (BSES; David, Okazaki, & Saw, 2009; See Appendix D). The BSES assesses individuals’ perception of their ability to function in both culture of origin and mainstream culture. It has 26 items encompassed within six subscales: (a) social groundedness, (b) communication ability, (c) knowledge, (d) role repertoire, (e) positive attitudes, and (f) bicultural beliefs. The Social Groundedness subscale (seven items) measures the degree to which the individual forms stable social connections with members of both cultural groups (e.g., “I can develop new relationships with both mainstream Americans as well as people from the same heritage culture as myself”). The communication ability subscale (four items) measures the individual’s effectiveness in communicating ideas and feelings, both verbally and nonverbally, with members of both cultural groups (e.g., “I can switch easily between standard English and the language of my heritage culture”). The knowledge subscale (four items) measures an individual’s awareness and knowledge of the history, institutions, and the practices and perspectives of a given culture (e.g., “I am knowledgeable about the gender roles and expectations of both mainstream Americans and my cultural group”). The role repertoire subscale (three items) measures the range of culturally or situationally appropriate behaviors or roles that the individual has learned and properly applies in any given situation (e.g., “I can choose the degree and manner by which I affiliate with each culture”). The positive attitudes subscale (four items) measures an individual’s awareness and knowledge of the history, institutions, and the practices and perspectives of a given culture (e.g., “I have respect for both mainstream American
culture and my heritage culture”). Finally, the bicultural beliefs subscale (four items) measures the individual’s belief, or confidence, that one can effectively balance the demands of both cultures without compromising one’s sense of identity (e.g., “It is acceptable for an individual from my heritage culture to participate in two different cultures”). Respondents rate each item on a 9-point rating system (1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating higher levels of bicultural self-efficacy.

David and colleagues (2009) tested the internal consistency of the BSES with college students (N = 266) from a mid-western university and found the following Cronbach’s alphas for the subscales: .91 (Social Groundedness), .79 (Communication Ability), .89 (Positive Attitudes Toward Both Groups), .80 (Knowledge), .69 (Role Repertoire), and .77 (Bicultural Beliefs). In a separate study with a different group of college students (N = 164), David et al. (2009) investigated the relationship of the BSES with both related and nonrelated constructs to provide validity support. The result indicated that the BSES was significantly related to the constructs of self-esteem, ethnic identity development, and lower levels of perceived acculturation gap, thus suggesting evidence of construct validity for the BSES.

The BSES has not been normed for adolescents. However, no alternative instrument was found that measured bicultural competence with EAA adolescents. Thus, the author had expert reviewers (N = 4) evaluate the BSES for age- and culture-appropriateness. The first reviewer was a licensed counselor who has worked extensively with Asian American adolescents for over five years. The second reviewer was a youth group counselor who had worked at an EAA church for five years. The third
reviewer was a high school teacher. The final reviewer was a faculty-researcher whose scholarly work focused on prevention and intervention strategies for at-risk children and adolescents. All reviewers stated that the BSES was appropriate for adolescence ages 12 – 17. The researcher also conducted a reliability check after data collection.

**Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale**

The researcher measured cultural identity using the Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS; Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004); see Appendix E. The AAMAS consists of three subscales which separately assesses an EAA individual's involvement in culture of origin (as measured by AAMAS-Culture of Origin [AAMAS-CO]), Pan-Asian culture (as measured by the AAMAS-Asian American [AAMAS-AA]), and European American culture (as measured by AAMAS-European American [AAMAS-EA]). Each scale comprised of 15 items using a 6-point Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from *not very much* to *very much*; with one item reverse scored. The researcher totaled the scores according to the respective subscales (i.e. AAMAS-CO total, AAMAS-AA total, and AAMAS-EA total). The total score of each subscale represented participants' level of acculturation. The last item of each respective scale was reversed scored. The higher score of each subscale indicated high levels of identification with culture of origin, Asian American, and European American cultural dimension. High scores for all the subscales indicate high levels of bicultural identity. Low scores on AAMAS-CO and high scores on AAMAS-EA indicate high assimilation. High scores on AAMAS-CO and low scores on AAMAS-EA indicated low assimilation (i.e., separation). Low scores on AAMAS-CO and AAMAS-EA indicated marginalization.

The AAMAS was tested with EAA young adults between ages 17 to 35 years ($N$...
The researchers reported an internal consistency of an alpha coefficient ranging between .87 to .91 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 to .83 for AAMAS-AA, and .76 to .81 for AAMAS-EA (Chung et al., 2004). Test-retest reliability for all three scales was measured at a two-week interval, and the coefficients were .89, .75, and .78, respectively.

Regarding concurrent validity, AAMAS-CO was inversely correlated with the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992), and the AAMAS-EA was strongly correlated with the SL-ASIA, providing support for validity.

The AAMAS was not normed for adolescents. However, no known alternative instrument existed that was normed with EAA adolescents. Thus, the author had expert reviewers (see reviewer description above) evaluate the instrument for age and cultural appropriateness. All, but one reviewer considered the AAMAS to be both age and culturally appropriate for use in the current study. The second reviewer stated that adolescents may have difficulty comprehending the written contents of the AAMAS. The researcher conducted a reliability check after data collection.

**Asian American Family Conflicts Scale**

Perception of parent-child conflict was measured using the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale (FCS; Lee R.M., Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000; shown in Appendix F). The FCS consists of 10-items that reflect typical disagreements between parents and their children in Asian values and practices. The unique aspect of assessing parent-child conflicts, using the FCS, is the emphasis on cultural differences between parents and their children (Lee et al., 2000). The FCS also consists of two subscales: (a) the likelihood of conflict occurrence (FCS-Likelihood) and (b) the seriousness of the conflict (FCS-Seriousness). The FCS-Likelihood subscale assesses the respondents’ perception of the likelihood that the conflicts will occur on each of the 10 items using a
5-point rating scale (1 = *almost never* to 5 = *almost always*). Likewise, the FCS-seriousness subscale assesses respondents’ perception of the severity of each of the 10-items, using a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *extremely*). The total score of the FCS ranges from 10 to 50 points, with a higher score indicating greater likelihood or severity of family culturally-based conflicts (Lee et al., 2000). The total score of each subscale represented participants’ perceived family conflicts and seriousness of the family conflicts. The higher score for the FCS-Likelihood scale indicated greater likelihood that participant experience culturally-based family conflicts. The higher score for the FCS-Seriousness scale indicated the severity of the conflicts as perceived by the participants.

The FCS has good reliability and validity with the Asian American college student population. Specifically, Lee et al., (2000) examined the psychometrics of the instrument with Asian American college students (N = 186) and found a Cronbach’s alphas of .89 and .91 for FCS-Likelihood and FCS-seriousness respectively, and the subscales correlated moderately with each other (r = .74). The stability reliability was also tested over a 3-week period, and the study result indicated a correlation of .80 for FCS-Likelihood and .85 for FCS-seriousness. This suggested that culturally-based conflicts in families are relatively stable across time, compared with the Social, Attitudinal, Family, and Environmental Acculturation Stress Scale (SAFE; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). The FCS correlated positively with the total score of the SAFE subscales that measured family conflicts, providing evidence of construct validity for the FCS (Lee et al., 2000).
The FCS was not normed for adolescents. However, no known alternative instrument existed that was normed with EAA adolescents. Thus, the author had expert reviewers (see reviewer description above) review the instrument for age appropriateness. All reviewers stated that the FCS was appropriate for adolescents ages 12 – 17.

**Student Life Satisfaction Scale**

Participants’ well-being is measured using Huebner’s (1991) Student Life Satisfaction Scale (SLSS), as shown in Appendix G. The SLSS is a 7-item self-report assessment which measures respondent’s subjective well-being and happiness with life. Respondents answer each item on a six-point Likert-type scale with responses ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*. Of the 7-items, two are reverse scored. A higher score on the SLSS indicates greater reports of overall subjective well-being. Conversely, a lower score indicates overall dissatisfaction with life.

Huebner (1991) examined for reliability and validity of the SLSS with 254 children between the ages of 7 to 14, with a mean age of 10.54. The results revealed an internal reliability of .84, and factor analysis provided support for the SLSS’ construct validity. In a second study, Huebner (1991) found support for concurrent validity of the SLSS. The researcher found a positive correlation between the SLSS and other measures of positive well-being (e.g., positive affect, life satisfaction), and a negative correlation with anxiety.

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The researcher developed a demographic questionnaire to gather general demographic information about the participants. The demographic questionnaire consisted of questions about age, gender, and grade (see Appendix B). Additionally,
one item asked participants to identify who they were living with, which was relevant when considering family’s influence and cultural teaching.

**Research Question and Research Hypotheses**

Two main research questions guided the current study: a.) Does bicultural competence predict bicultural identity development in EAA youth? and b.) Is an increase in bicultural identity associated with EAA adolescents’ well-being and family conflict?

The author proposed the following research hypotheses:

**Research Hypothesis One**

Bicultural competence (as measured by the Bicultural Self-Efficacy Scale [BSES]; David, Okazaki, & Shaw, 2009) in both Asian and U.S. American cultures is correlated with the development of bicultural identity (as measured by the Asian American Multidimensional Scale [AAMAS]; Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004) in EAA youth.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

An increase in level of bicultural competence predicts an increase in level of subjective well-being (as measured by the Student Life-Satisfaction Scale [SLSS]; Huebner, 1991) in EAA youth.

**Research Hypothesis Three**

An increase in bicultural competence predicts a decrease in parent-child conflicts (as measured by the Asian American Conflict Scale [FCS]; Lee et al., 2000) in EAA families.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

EAA adolescents participating in the bicultural skills development intervention will demonstrate an increase in bicultural competence, while those in the comparison group will show no changes in bicultural competence.
Data Analysis

The researcher conducted a Pearson product moment correlation to examine hypothesis one. To analyzing hypothesis two and three, the researcher conducted a simple linear regression. For hypothesis two, the independent variable was bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) and the dependent variable was participants’ subjective well-being (as measured by the SLSS). A simple linear regression analysis can explain the relationships of the variables in terms of predictability. In other words, an increase in bicultural competence would predict well-being. Similarly, the researcher also examined hypothesis three using linear regression analysis. The independent variable was bicultural competence and the dependent variable was Asian American family conflict (as measured by FCS). The researcher attempted to measure whether an increase in bicultural competence would predict a decrease in family conflicts. The researcher also conducted an a priori power analysis, using G*Power software with an alpha level of .05, a minimum power established at .80, and a moderate effect size of .15 (Cohen, 1988). The power analysis revealed that a minimum of 68 participants were needed to find a statistical significant difference using linear regression analysis.

The researcher conducted an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to examine hypothesis four. This method of analysis increases the strength of a quasi-experimental design. Specifically, the ANCOVA reduces the initial differences between groups by making compensating adjustments to the data (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Because randomization was not possible in the current study, the researcher conducted the ANCOVA to reduce the variability of the posttest scores through controlling the covariate variable (Covariance designs, n.d.). This procedure is appropriate for studies with smaller samples sizes (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). The researcher also conducted
an a priori power analysis using G*Power software for ANCOVA, and found that a minimum sample of 64 participants is necessary to find a statistical difference between the treatment and the comparison group over time (pretest to posttest). The calculation was based on an alpha level of .05, a minimum power established at .80, and an effect size \( f = .40 \) based on Cohen’s (1988) guidelines. The independent variable was the curriculum training with two levels, a pretest and posttest condition. The dependent variable was level of bicultural competence. Thus, the researcher examined the effectiveness of the East West Connection intervention in increasing bicultural competence.

**Ethical Considerations**

To ensure the welfare and safety of the participants, the researcher obtained approval to conduct the study from the institutional review board (IRB) at the researcher’s institution prior to the start of data collection. The researcher anticipated that the adolescent participants would experience no more than minimal risk participating in the study. Minimal risk, according to Code of Federal Regulation (USHHS, 2009), refers to the probability and severity of any physical, psychological, or emotional harm or discomfort exceeding what would be encountered in daily life or during standard physical and psychological testing. With the potential for the participants to reveal personal information that could cause feelings of distress several safeguards were taken by the researcher. First, the researcher ensured that all of the participants understood the confidentiality agreement, as described in the IRB protocol. Second, participants were reminded to only disclose information that they feel comfortable sharing with the group. Third, co-facilitators were enlisted to provide counseling for any youth who may experience distress or discomfort. The co-facilitators
were the church youth group counselors or leaders who were familiar with the participants. Lastly, participants were informed that their involvement in the study was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without negative consequences.

Chapter Summary

The current chapter included an overview of the study. The sample population consisted of 1.5 and second-generation EAA adolescents between the ages 12 – 18. To recruit participants, the researcher contacted Asian ethnic churches in different cities in the state of Florida. The study was a quasi-experimental design that allowed the researcher to investigate if increasing bicultural competence predicted improved subjective well-being and decreased family conflicts among EAA youths. The chapter included a description of the procedures, the setting, and the instruments. Next, the researcher reviewed the researcher hypothesis and the data analysis procedures. The researcher used Simple Linear Regression and ANCOVA to analyze the data. Finally, the chapter included a discussion of ethical considerations. The next chapter will present the results of the study.
Figure 3-1. East West Connection Conceptual Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Asian or American: Growing up in the U.S. as an Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Identity and Culture: Who am I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>When East meets West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Review, Integrate, and Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between biculturalism and psychosocial outcomes (i.e., subjective well-being and family conflict), and the effectiveness of a four-week bicultural training for improving the bicultural identity development of EAA youth. In this chapter, the researcher presents the sample demographics and the results of the hypotheses testing.

Demographics

In the beginning of the study, the sample consisted of 37 EAA adolescents in the treatment group and 25 EAA adolescents in the comparison group (\(N = 62\)). However, data from 11 participants were excluded from the final analysis because these participants did not attend all the sessions or did not complete a posttest assessment. Thus, data from 51 participants were analyzed in the study, consisting of 34 (67%) youth in the treatment group and 17 (33%) in the comparison group.

Within the treatment group, 16 (47%) were male and 18 (53%) were female. Additionally, within the comparison group, eight were male (47%) and nine were female (47%). Participants in the treatment group were between ages 12 to 18 (\(M = 14.50; SD = 1.86\)) and their grade level ranged from 6th to 12th grade (\(M = 9.26; SD = 1.75\)). Participants in the comparison group were between ages 12 to 18 (\(M = 14.65, SD = 1.84\)) and their grade level ranged from 6th to 12th grade (\(M = 9.12; SD = 1.90\)). Four participants did not indicate their ages. The treatment group consisted of Chinese-American youth (\(n = 31\)) and multiethnic Asian Americans (\(n = 3\)). The comparison group consisted of Korean-American youth (\(n = 15\)) and multiethnic Asian Americans (\(n = 2\)). An independent t-test indicated that there was no significant difference between
levels of bicultural identity between the treatment and comparison group at pretest, \( t(49) = .395, p > .05 \). Table 4-1 presents the participant demographics.

**Reliability Check**

The researcher conducted preliminary analyses prior to analyzing the study hypotheses. The AAMAS, BSES, and FCS had not previously been tested with adolescents, therefore the researcher conducted a reliability check on three of the chosen scales to ensure that the assessments were appropriate for the sample. For the AAMAS, the analysis revealed Cronbach’s alphas of .84 for the AAMAS-CO, .85 for the AAMAS-AA, and .89 for the AAMAS-EA. The alphas were similar to the results in the study by Chung, Kim, and Abreu (2004). They reported an internal consistency range of .87 to .91 for AAMAS-CO, .78 to .83 for AAMAS-AA, and .76 to .81 for AAMAS-EA. Thus, the researcher considered the assessment reliable for measuring levels of acculturation for the current sample.

For BSES, the reliability test produced Cronbach’s alphas of .82 for social groundedness, .77 for communication ability, .83 for positive attitudes toward both groups, .76 for knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, .38 for role repertoire, and .73 for bicultural beliefs. David, Okazaki, and Saw (2009) reported similar alphas except for knowledge of cultural beliefs and values and role repertoire subscales. In their study, they reported an internal consistency ranging between .89 to .91 for social groundedness, .78 to .79 for communication ability, .84 to .89 for positive attitude toward both groups, .80 to .86 for knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, .63 to .69 for role repertoire, and .71 to .77 for bicultural beliefs. Thus, the researcher determined that the assessment was reliable for four of the six subscales of bicultural self-efficacy applied to the study’s participants.
For the FCS, the test produced alphas of .79 for the FCS Likelihood and .81 for the FCS-Seriousness subscales. Lee and colleagues (2000) reported similar range of alpha for the FCS-Likelihood (.81 to .89), but a slightly lower alpha for FCS-Seriousness (.84 to .91). Thus, the assessment was considered a reliable measure of family conflict for the current sample.

**Preliminary Analyses Relevant for All Statistical Tests Used**

After data screening, the researcher identified missing data. Little’s (1988) test was applied to determine the pattern of the missing data ($\chi^2 = 4.81; p > .05$). The result suggested that the missing values were missing complete at random (MCAR). Since the assumption of MCAR was met, the researcher proceeded with the listwise deletion approach in analyzing the data. Listwise deletion is a systemic method of addressing missing values in a systematic manner (Acock, 2005). Some researchers (i.e., Schlomer et al., 2010; Fox-Wasylyshyn & El-Masri, 2005) argued against using listwise deletion because of the decrease in power. However, listwise deletion provides an unbiased estimate of the analysis if the assumption of MCAR is met (Acock, 2005). Furthermore, Allen (2002) noted that listwise deletion has the least concern with inferential errors relative to other methods used to address missing data, and it is the preferred approach for individuals who lack experience in conducting sophisticated statistical procedures.

There are currently no consensus how much missing data would be considered problematic for analysis (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010). For example, Schafer (1997) recommended that 5% missing data would not significantly affect the data analysis, while Peng et al. (2006) reported using 20% missing data in their research. Acock (2005) argued that setting a high cutoff rate (i.e., 40% and more of missing
values) as criteria can lead to a loss of 20 – 50% of the total data, leaving the researcher with very few usable data sets for analyses. Conversely, too low of a cutoff rate (i.e., 10% or less of missing values) may lead to inaccurate statistical results (Acock, 2005). In considering the recommendations of both Acock (2005) and Schlomer et al. (2010), a middle ground for the cutoff rate may be around 30% of missing values. Thus, in order to maximize the available data for analysis, the researcher omitted data \((n = 8)\) that contained 30% or more missing values. For cases with missing items less than 30% \((n = 4)\), the missing values remained, but were omitted during the sub-score calculation procedure. In regard to the assumption of independence, the participants were either assigned to the treatment or the comparison group. Therefore, the observations between and within groups were independent.

**Research Hypothesis One**

The researcher conducted a Pearson product moment correlation to test hypothesis one: Bicultural competence in East Asian and U.S. American cultures (as measured by the AAMAS) is associated with the development of bicultural identity in EAA youth (as measured by the BSES). In addition to the preliminary analyses discussed above, the researcher also examined and found evidence of linearity between bicultural competence and bicultural identity. Thus, the researcher proceeded with conducting the Pearson’s correlation.

The AAMAS consisted of three subscales, AAMAS-CO, AAMAS-AA, and AAMAS-EA. The BSES consisted of six subscales, SGPre, COMPre, PAPre, KnowPre, RRPre and BiBPre. The item scores for each subscale for both instruments were averaged respectively. Table 4-2 presents the results of the correlation analysis. Overall, bicultural competence correlated significantly with bicultural identity. The
AAMAS-AA was significantly correlated with the BSES-Know variable. However, the BSES-BiB was not correlated with any of the AAMAS variables. Nevertheless, the results support hypothesis one.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

The researcher conducted a linear regression analysis to test hypothesis two: An increase in level of bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) predicts an increase in EAA youth’s well-being (as measured by the SLSS). The researcher conducted an a priori power analysis using G*Power software with an alpha level of .05, a minimum power established at .80, and a moderate effect size of .15 (Cohen, 1988) and found that a minimum of 68 participants was needed to find a statistical significant difference. However, there were only 51 participants in the current study; therefore, any generalizability of the analysis should be considered with caution.

In addition to the assumption of independence examined above, the researcher examined the additional tests of assumptions for simple linear regression. The scatter plot, in Figure 4-1, illustrates that the relationship between bicultural competence (as measured by BSES) and well-being (as measured by the SLSS) is reasonably linear; therefore, the assumption of linearity was satisfied. A Shapiro-Wilks test was conducted to test the assumption of normality. The results suggested that the sample distribution for residuals was statistically significantly different than what would be expected from a normal distribution ($SW = .907$, $df = 51$, $p < .05$). The unstandardized residual’s skewness (-1.22) and kurtosis (4.439) statistics was further evidence of nonnormality. In case of nonnormality, Lomax and Hahs-Vaughn (2012) suggested that nonzero skewness has a stronger impact on the analysis than nonzero kurtosis. Moreover, they noted that nonnormality is a concern when the skewness value is larger than 2. As
noted previously, the skewness was -1.22, which does not exceed the suggested value. Thus, the researcher proceeded with the regression analysis. The researcher also tested for independence of errors with the Durbin-Watson statistic and the score of 2.09 was within acceptable range (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). This suggests that assumption of independent errors has been met. Levene’s test indicated equal variance for both BSES (BSES-SG \([F = .51, p > .05]\); BSES-COM \([F = .00, p > .05]\); BSES-KNOW \([F = .00, p > .05]\); BSES-PA \([F = 1.26, p > .05]\); BSES-RR \([F = .29, p > .05]\); BSES-BiB \([F = .02, p > .05]\)) and SLSS \((F = .47, p > .05)\).

The results of the simple linear regression demonstrated that a significant proportion of the total variation in well-being was predicted by bicultural competence. This indicates that bicultural competence is a good predictor of subjective well-being, \(F(6, 44) = 3.85, p < .05\). Additionally, the regression model predicted that 34\% \((R^2 = .34)\) of the variance in subjective well-being was due to bicultural competence. Thus, the results supported hypothesis two.

**Research Hypothesis Three**

The researcher conducted a regression analysis to examine hypothesis three: An increase in levels of bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) would predict a decrease in parent-child conflicts in EAA families (as measured by the FCS). The researcher conducted an a priori power analysis and determined that a minimum of 68 participants was needed to find a statistical significant difference. However, the current study only had data from 51 participants; therefore, the researcher did not meet the minimum sample size to adequately detect statistical significance. Therefore, any generalizability of the analysis should be considered with caution.
Simple linear regression assumptions were tested for both scales. The results of
the test of assumptions for the BSES followed the same procedure as described in
hypothesis two. The FCS consisted of two subscales: FCS-Likelihood and FCS-
Seriousness. The item scores for each subscale were averaged. The sub-scores are
measured on a continuous scale. A composite score of the FCS was also calculated by
adding the subscale mean scores and dividing by two.

The scatter plot in Figure 4-2 shows a small, but positive linear relationship
between bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) and family conflict (as
measured by the FCS). Thus, the assumption of linearity is reasonable. A Shapiro-Wilks
test was conducted to determine whether assumption of normality was met. The results
suggested that the sample distribution for residuals was not statistically significantly
different than what would be expected from a normal distribution ($SW = .98, df = 51, p <
.05$). Further evidence of normality was found in the unstandardized residual's
skewness ($-.19$) and kurtosis ($-.08$) statistics. The Durbin-Watson statistic was
computed to evaluated independence of errors and was 1.98, which is considered
acceptable. This suggests that assumption of independent errors has been met. Test of
homogeneity for BSES was reported in examining hypothesis two. Levene’s test
indicated equal variance for FCS (FCS-Likelihood [$F = 1.57, p > .05$]; FCS-Seriousness
[$F = 2.79, p > .05$]).

The results of the linear regression analysis revealed that there was no
statistically significant relationship between bicultural competence and family conflict.
Therefore, the level of bicultural competence is not a predictor of family conflict, $F(1, 49)
= .116, p > .05$. Thus, hypothesis three was not supported.
Research Hypothesis Four

The researcher conducted an ANCOVA to examine hypothesis four: EAA adolescents participating in the bicultural skills development intervention will demonstrate an increase in levels of bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES), while those in the comparison group will demonstrate no change in level of bicultural competence. A minimum of 62 participants was needed to find a statistical significant difference. However, the current study only had data from 51 participants; therefore, the researcher did not meet the minimum sample size to adequately detect statistical significance. Any generalizability of the analysis should be considered with caution.

ANCOVA assumptions were tested for the BSES. The BSES consisted of six subscales, SGPre, COMPre, PAPre, KnowPre, RRPre and BiBPre. The item scores for each subscale were averaged. All subscale scores were measured on a continuous scale. A Shapiro-Wilk normality test was conducted for all the BSES subscales to test for a normal distribution of posttest score for each level of group (treatment and comparison). As shown in Table 4-3, the p value of SG, RR, and BiB for the treatment group, and PA for both the treatment and comparison groups indicated a violation of normality. Thus, a square transformation was conducted for each listed dependent variable. The new variables, satisfied the test of assumption of normality. The scatterplots, Figure 4-3 through 4-8, illustrated the relationship between each subscale pretest and posttest score. The assumption of linearity was met for all variables. Test of homogeneity for BSES was calculated in hypothesis two.

The results of the ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of the covariate, BSES pretest score, on the dependent variable, BSES posttest scores. However, there was no statistical significant effect of the curriculum for posttest scores.
The results are shown in Tables 4-4 through 4-9. In sum, while there was an increase in BSES score from pretest and posttest, the intervention did not significantly increase bicultural competence for the treatment group relative to the comparison group. See Table 4-10.

Chapter Summary

This chapter focused on the results of examining the research hypotheses. The results supported hypothesis one that bicultural competence was correlated with bicultural identity development for EAA adolescents. The results also revealed that an increase in bicultural competence predicted an increase in subjective well-being (hypothesis two). However, the results indicated that an increase in bicultural competence did not predict a decrease in family conflict among EAA families (hypothesis three). Furthermore, the results of the ANCOVA revealed that the East West Connection curriculum did not predict an increase in bicultural competence (hypothesis four). Chapter 5 will focus on a discussion of the results, study limitations, and implications for research and practice.
Table 4-1. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.18%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAMAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Culture of Origin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asian American</td>
<td>.507&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. European American</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Groundedness</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.514&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication Ability</td>
<td>.543&quot;</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.645&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive Attitude Toward Both Groups</td>
<td>.287*</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.370&quot;</td>
<td>.696&quot;</td>
<td>.463&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Knowledge of Cultural Beliefs and Values</td>
<td>.671&quot;</td>
<td>.366&quot;</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>.653&quot;</td>
<td>.589&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role Repertoire</td>
<td>.367&quot;</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.614&quot;</td>
<td>.492&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bicultural Beliefs</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.408&quot;</td>
<td>.323&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. AAMAS = Asian American Multidimensional Scale; BSES = Bicultural Self-Efficacy Scale

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Figure 4-1. Scatterplot of the relationship between bicultural competence and well-being
Figure 4-2. Scatterplot of the relationship between bicultural competence and family conflicts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiB_post</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

<sup>a</sup> Lilliefors Significance Correction
Figure 4-3. The scatter plot of SG-post (DV) and pre-SG (covariate)
Figure 4-4. The scatter plot of COM-post (DV) and pre-COM (covariate)
Figure 4-5. The scatter plot of PA-post (DV) and pre-PA (covariate)
Figure 4-6. The scatter plot of Know-post (DV) and pre-Know (covariate)
Figure 4-7. The scatter plot of RR-post (DV) and pre-RR (covariate)
Figure 4-8. The scatter plot of BiB-post (DV) and pre-BiB (covariate)
Table 4-4. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects ANCOVA BSES-SG
Dependent Variable:  SG_post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>10653.014(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5326.507</td>
<td>34.723</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1306.113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1306.113</td>
<td>8.515</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGPre</td>
<td>10072.965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10072.965</td>
<td>65.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>519.766</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>519.766</td>
<td>3.388</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7209.728</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>153.398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140363.728</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) R Squared = .596 (Adjusted R Squared = .579)
Table 4-5. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects ANCOVA BSES-Com
Dependent Variable: COMpost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>95.914(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.957</td>
<td>34.701</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.648</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.648</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPre</td>
<td>92.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92.030</td>
<td>66.591</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>63.572</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2058.951</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>159.486</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) R Squared = .601 (Adjusted R Squared = .584)
Table 4-6. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects ANCOVA BSES-PA
Dependent Variable: PApost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>12255.547\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6127.774</td>
<td>37.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1244.999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1244.999</td>
<td>7.591</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPre</td>
<td>12185.865</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12185.865</td>
<td>74.303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>256.230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>256.230</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7708.084</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>164.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189803.662</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected</td>
<td>19963.631</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} R Squared = .614 (Adjusted R Squared = .597)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>38.645(^{a})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.322</td>
<td>21.328</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>14.359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.359</td>
<td>15.849</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KnowPre</td>
<td>38.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.413</td>
<td>42.401</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>41.674</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2422.188</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>80.319</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) R Squared = .481 (Adjusted R Squared = .459)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5715.299a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2857.649</td>
<td>10.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>109.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.326</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRPre</td>
<td>5477.679</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5477.679</td>
<td>20.673</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>742.570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>742.570</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12453.261</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>264.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140692.534</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>18168.559</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .315 (Adjusted R Squared = .285)
Table 4-9. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects ANCOVA BSES-BiB
Dependent Variable:  BB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5887.927a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2943.964</td>
<td>12.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiBPre</td>
<td>5856.295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5856.295</td>
<td>24.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>119.725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119.725</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11459.154</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>243.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163317.652</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>17347.081</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .339 (Adjusted R Squared = .311)
Table 4.10. Descriptive Statistics BSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGpost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>7.0515</td>
<td>18.98844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6.5350</td>
<td>18.94585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8829</td>
<td>19.09308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMpost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>6.0858</td>
<td>1.77712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6.6500</td>
<td>1.92910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.2621</td>
<td>1.82445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PApost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>7.5455</td>
<td>1.52127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>7.3331</td>
<td>1.72401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.4761</td>
<td>1.57537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWpost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>6.8409</td>
<td>1.37474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>7.0167</td>
<td>1.15907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8958</td>
<td>1.30142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRpost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>6.9300</td>
<td>1.63079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6.6875</td>
<td>1.30713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8508</td>
<td>1.52319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiBpost</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>7.2424</td>
<td>1.46240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>7.1356</td>
<td>1.44406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.2076</td>
<td>1.44221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes the purpose and reviews findings from the study. It discusses the findings from Chapter 4 with respect to the theoretical frameworks proposed in Chapter 2. Recommendations are made for scholars interested in conducting future research on East Asian American youth and for practitioners working in clinical settings with this population.

Summary of the Study

There is growing interest in biculturalism in mental health research (Chae & Foley, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2013). For example, past researchers have found that cultural identity development is linked to social and emotional well-being and social adjustment among minority individuals (Phinney, 2001; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). However, there is a significant gap in the literature on the development and well-being of EAA youth (Xia, 2013). Therefore, this study sought to contribute to the existing literature by examining the role of culture in EAA adolescent identity formation.

The current study consisted of a sample of 51 EAA Chinese- and Korean-American adolescents between ages 12 to 18. Scholars contend that immigrant youth experience acculturation differently than adults, thus affecting identity development (Yoshikawa, Mistry, & Wang, 2016). There is a lack of knowledge regarding the adolescence period of identity development as it relates to the culture of youth from diverse backgrounds. Previous acculturation research merely focused on the experiences of young adults or on parent-child relationships (e.g., Kim et al., 2009; Fan & Ashdown, 2014; Ying, 1999). The current study expanded on previous research two
ways: (a) identifying and including a sample of EAA adolescents from the community; and (b) using a set of surveys adapted for this population of adolescents.

The current study was based on acculturation and bicultural identity theories, which suggest that the development of a strong cultural identity in both the culture of origin and mainstream culture is associated with positive psychosocial outcomes (e.g. Chae & Foley, 2010, Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). This study investigated the constructs of cultural identity development and acculturation, and their role in the overall well-being, namely in the areas of life satisfaction and family conflict as indices of well-being of EAA youth. These constructs were examined through evaluation of a four-week bicultural skills training intervention focused on enhancing EAA youth’s bicultural competence. The primary goal of the study was to examine how a new intervention program with EAA youth related to adolescents’ sense of bicultural identity.

The researcher posed four hypotheses and analyzed the data collected. First, the researcher conducted a Pearson moment product correlation to examine the potential relationship between bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) and bicultural identity development (as measured by the AAMAS). Next, the researcher conducted a linear regression analysis to investigate whether an increase in level of bicultural competence (as measured by the BSES) predicted an increase in level of well-being (as measured by the SLSS) and a decrease in level of family conflict (as measured by the FCS). Lastly, the researcher used an ANCOVA to examine the effectiveness of the East West Curriculum in enhancing bicultural competence, and whether it led to an increase in level of bicultural identity and well-being, and a decrease in level of family conflict. Each of the hypotheses are discussed below.
Research Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis theorized that bicultural competence was correlated with bicultural identity. The researcher posited that the six dimensions of bicultural competence, as measured by the BSES (David, Okazaki, & Shaw, 2009), would be indicators of bicultural identity development, as measured by the AAMAS (Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004). This hypothesis was examined using Pearson moment correlation. The results supported the hypothesis ($r = .55; p < .05$), thus suggesting that bicultural competence was positively correlated with bicultural identity development. Thus, enhancing EAA youth’s competence along the six domains of cultural competence facilitated bicultural identity development.

Individuals who possess a bicultural identity have synthesized both cultural identities (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Schwartz et al., 2016). High levels of competence in both culture (i.e., appropriately responding to complex cultural situations) is an indicator of biculturalism (LaFromboise et al., 1993). LaFromboise and colleagues (1993) hypothesized that there are six components of cultural competence. These components were empirically tested and validated by David and colleagues (2009) with college students. However, the relationship between bicultural competence and bicultural identity for EAA adolescents was assumed. The findings in the present study support the claim that bicultural competence is correlated with bicultural identity in EAA youth (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Specifically, the result indicated that a positive relationship existed between five of the six components of bicultural competence and participants’ level of bicultural identity. Further research is needed to understand why bicultural beliefs was not significantly correlated with bicultural identity.
A correlation analysis, however, does not indicate causality or direction of causality. Instead, the analysis only indicated that the two constructs are related. Moreover, there may be additional variables that were not explored in the current study (e.g., do all components of bicultural competence important) that affect bicultural identity development. Nevertheless, the result of the analysis yielded useful information for understanding biculturalism among EAA adolescents.

**Research Hypothesis Two**

The second hypothesized theorized that bicultural identity development would predict an increase in subjective well-being, as measured by general life satisfaction. Issues with regards to EAA youth's mental health are often acculturation-based, such as parental pressure to succeed in academics (Xia et al., 2013), living up to the MMS (Thompson, King, & Witksow, 2016), and family obligations (Lee & Mjelde-Mossey, 2004). Scholars hypothesized that individuals with strong bicultural identity can effectively cope with these acculturative stressors, and thus are expected to report higher levels of well-being (Berry, 2006; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). In the current study, participants reported a high mean score across the six components of biculturalism, which also significantly predicted well-being.

The results were consistent with previous research in that it showed biculturalism as predictor of positive psychosocial outcomes and adjustment for immigrants of collectivist cultures (Birman, 2011; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Chae and Foley (2010) found that maintaining a strong sense of connection with one’s EAA community, while adapting to the U.S. culture, can enhance overall sense of well-being and adjustment for EAA youth. With regards to identity development, scholars hypothesized that identity synthesis is associated with an individual’s psychological well-being.
(Erikson, 1956; Marcia, 1966). Given that biculturalism is associated with positive well-being in EAA youth, the development of bicultural competence has an important role in well-being. Scholars also argue that bicultural identity for immigrant youth is similar to the concept of a synthesized identity (e.g., Choi et al., 2016; Schwartz et al., 2013; Yoshikawa et al., 2016). Thus, the current study demonstrated support for the importance of promoting biculturalism in EAA youth. However, the results contradicts Rudmin’s (2003) assertion that biculturalism represented a precarious condition for individuals - whom may feel conflicted between both cultures. Instead, adolescents who maintain a connection with their East Asian culture, while also regularly participating in the U.S. American culture are more likely to respond appropriately to cultural pressures and show better psychological adjustments (Schwartz et al., 2016).

**Research Hypothesis Three**

The third research hypothesis theorized that the researcher proposed that bicultural identity development would predict family cohesion, as measured by EAA youth’s perceived frequency and severity of parent-child conflict in their families. This led the researcher to hypothesize that increasing bicultural competence would predict a decrease family conflicts. The linear regression analysis revealed that bicultural competence was not a significant predictor of family conflict. The treatment group ($n = 34$) reported, on average, low scores for likelihood of conflicts ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.00$) and severity of conflicts ($M = 2.18$, $SD = .72$) at pretest. The comparison group ($n = 17$) reported, on average, low scores for likelihood of conflicts ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 1.11$) and severity of conflicts ($M = 1.63$, $SD = .66$).

One source of acculturative stress that EAA adolescents experience is the cultural dissonance between themselves and their immigrant parents or caregivers (Xie,
Cultural dissonance is related to increased family conflict in EAA families that can negatively affect EAA youth’s well-being (Wu & Chao, 2005; Xie et al., 2013). Additionally, Lee and colleagues (2000) contended that EAA students commonly attribute psychological distress to their relationships with their caregivers. Scholars hypothesized that openness in communication and adolescents’ appreciation for their culture of origin can moderate the negative effects of cultural dissonance (Chee, Rhang, & Chee, 2003; Wu & Chao, 2011). These factors align closely with LaFromboise et al. (1993) concepts of communication abilities and knowledge of cultural values and practices. Therefore, the researcher expected that increasing bicultural competence would predict a decrease in EAA family conflicts.

The current finding contrasts scholars’ claim that endorsing both East Asian and U.S. American culture can moderate the effects of cultural dissonance. In the present study, participants’ level of bicultural competence was unrelated to their self-report of likeliness and seriousness of family conflict. A possible explanation for the non-significant finding might be due to the fact that the proposed bicultural competence components (LaFromboise et al., 1993) were unrelated to EAA family conflicts. There may be other variables, not captured in the current study, that may better explain the relationship between cultural dissonance and conflict in EAA families. For example, EAA’s emphasis on family harmony and filial piety (Chang, 2007) may decrease instances of family conflicts that adolescents experience at home. Scholars may also consider the role of religion and socioeconomic status (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Therefore, it may be more appropriate to study EAA family conflict beyond that of communication or cultural knowledge factors.
Research Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis examined differences between pre- and posttest group scores on the AAMAS based on participation in the intervention. The study examined the effectiveness of a bicultural skills development program for EAA youth. The result of the ANCOVA revealed an increase in bicultural competence score for the treatment group, but not for the comparison group. However, the observed changes were not statistically significant. Thus, the researcher concluded that the intervention did not facilitate an increase in bicultural competence.

The existing literature has demonstrated that bicultural skill building increases youth’s appreciation for both culture of origin and mainstream culture and facilitates cultural identity exploration (Phinney, 2001; Schwartz et al., 2014; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Furthermore, interventions from prior studies on adults focused on building bicultural skills (e.g., interpersonal skills, coping skills) in cultural minorities (e.g., LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983; Malgady et al., 1990; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009; Szapocznik et al., 1984) in order to promote well-being and decrease problem behaviors associated with acculturative stressors. Because there were no intervention programs specific to EAA youth that exists, the researcher could only compare the results with the most recent bicultural skill intervention program, Entre Dos Mundos (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009). The results from this study did not align with Smokowski and Bacallao’s study, who found a significant increase in biculturalism. In the present study, only a marginal mean score showed an increase, from pretest to post test, across all six components of bicultural competence construct, and there was no statistically significant increase in bicultural competence.
An important difference between the East West Connection and past bicultural programs may be the length of the curriculum. Previous bicultural skills programs consisted of an eight-week intervention, whereas the East West Connection consisted of only a four-week intervention. It is conceivable that four weeks may have been insufficient time for participants to consider the role that culture affects their lives. For example, in the Entre Dos Mundos study, Smokowski and Bacallao (2011) reported that it took families beyond the eight-week program to fully integrate the new coping skills time and for the positive changes in parent-child relationships to occur. Additional sessions may allow participants to practice and improve bicultural skills. Thus, the amount of time spent developing bicultural knowledge and skills is an important factor to consider in a bicultural skills training program.

Limitations

The current study has several limitations that warrant further consideration when interpreting the findings. The first limitation is in regard to the nature of a quasi-experimental design. The current study lacked randomization and matched sample which significantly reduced the internal validity, limiting the generalizability of the results (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Moreover, the researcher could not control for any pre-existing factors such as participants’ generational status, education, socioeconomic status, and others, thus treatment and comparison groups are likely not equivalent. Despite such limitations, a quasi-experimental design can still yield useful information when executed correctly (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002).

Second, the study consisted of a small sample size ($N = 51$) consisting of 34 EAA adolescents in the treatment group and 17 EAA adolescents in the comparison group. An a priori power analysis indicated that a minimum of 62 participants was
needed for a large effect size, in conducting an ANCOVA. Recruiting EAA participants, especially children and adolescents, continues to be a challenge for researchers. An online search in the *Journal of Counseling and Development* and the *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* revealed that the majority of published studies with EAA often used college age or adult participants. Only a few studies focused specifically on EAA youth. For example, Omizo, Kim, & Abel's (2008) study examined help seeking behavior among 112 EAA high school participants in Hawaii. Additionally, Yeh et al. (2005) qualitative study of Korean immigrant youth’s cultural negotiation experiences consisted of 13 participants. Thus, more attention is needed in the recruitment and retention of EAA adolescent participants.

Third, although the researcher collected data from participants in metropolitan and small town communities rather than in agencies, the participants were all from one state in the southeast. Therefore, the findings may not be generalizable beyond EAA adolescents living in that state. Furthermore, the participants in the current study were all members of an Asian American church. Kim (2004) noted that EAA churches can serve as a buffer against many acculturative stressors. However, due to the participants’ involvement with a church, the participants’ acculturation experiences may not be representative of non-Christian EAAs.

Fourth, the researcher relied on self-report assessments, collected at pretest and posttest only, to measure bicultural competence, and there is a lack of assessments, normed for adolescents, that measure this construct. Despite taking steps to ensure age appropriateness of the assessments, some participants may interpret the items differently than others. For example, some participants may interpret the meaning of
mainstream culture as their immediate environment (i.e., Hispanic culture in Miami), while others may interpret this as the U.S. American culture. Thus, the results of the study could conceivably be affected by how participants understood the questionnaire. Additionally, when assessing for reliability of the instruments, the results indicated that the BSES-Know alpha was slightly lower, than what the scale developers reported. However, it was still within the acceptable range. Even more concerning was the low reliability score for the BSES-RR ($\alpha = .38$). Therefore, any interpretation of the analysis should be considered with caution. This limitation further highlights issues in research regarding a general lack of appropriate instruments to measure cultural and identity constructs for EAA adolescents.

**Implications for Research**

EAA youth are confronted not only with the task of resolving their identity crisis (Erikson, 1986; Marcia, 1966), but they must also attend to tasks of negotiating two (or more) cultural streams in identity development (Costigan, Su, & Hua, 2009; Schwartz et al., 2013). The lack of research has resulted in a limited understanding of the role of culture ad identity in EAA adolescents’ well-being.

One of the challenges of conducting research with EAA population is recruiting a sufficient number of participants. In previous studies, researchers experienced challenges with recruiting a large and representative sample of EAA. One reason for this is due to different cultural barriers, such EAAs’ negative attitude towards mental health and language (USDHHS, 2001). In the current study, many parents/caregivers of the participants initially appeared apprehensive about their children’s participation. Other EAA groups were less willing to enroll their children as part of a research study. Thus, it is crucial for researchers to devote adequate time to discuss research studies.
with parents/caregivers during the recruitment process and have follow-up sessions with them after the completion of studies to share the findings and discuss the implications for them.

Next, the majority of the existing research on the relationship of identity, culture, and well-being, often depicts Asian Americans as a homogenous group. This is problematic because it can perpetuate the stereotype that all Asian Americans share the same values and culture. Chu and Sue (2011) noted that there is a great heterogeneity between Asian American subgroups, including language, religion, socioeconomic status, cultural history, generational status, and country of nativity, all of which can influence research results. Thus, ignoring the between-groups differences among Asian American samples can lead to inaccurate research conclusions about the population (Chae & Foley, 2016). The current study focused on the experiences of the EAA population. In doing so, the researcher developed the bicultural skills intervention using culturally appropriate and relevant contents. Future research should continue to focus on ethnic-specific or sub-group specific (i.e., East Asia, South Asia, Pacific Islanders) participants.

Next, a review of the data revealed that most participants reported high identification with both the East Asian ($M = 4.18, SD = .73$) and U.S. cultures ($M = 4.59; SD = .77$) at pretest. Thus, participants maintain a strong connection with their family's culture of origin even though they lack the cultural support from their immediate context. This finding is somewhat surprising given the environment that participants reside. While the large urban environment could be considered a bicultural context (i.e., a community that integrates Hispanic and U.S. American cultures), participants do not
identify with the two cultural streams, so participants would not consider their environment to endorse their cultural identity. Similarly, participants from the other cities do not consider their respective environments to endorse EAA biculturalism. This is somewhat contrary to Schwartz and Unger's (2010) argument that individuals are at a disadvantage to develop a bicultural identity when specific conditions are not present. One possible reason for this may be that it is conceivable that participants' involvement in their respective ethnic church may facilitate both acculturation and enculturation. This is consistent with Choi's (2014) findings. Thus, future research may include assessing the importance of these community resources in promoting biculturalism.

Lastly, in conducting the present study, the researcher also identified a lack of empirically validated measurements specific for EAA youth. Future research may focus on the development of assessments that accurately assess the multidimensionality of acculturation for youth. Additionally, researchers may conduct qualitative studies to understand the experiences of contemporary EAA youth in negotiating aspects of different cultures. Assessments in the current study also focused on the self-report data. This method was useful in gaining insight into EAA adolescents’ perception of their identity development processes. However, including data from multiple perspectives (i.e., parents) may further expand upon the understanding of EAA adolescent development. Therefore, future research may involve various modifications to instrumentation.

**Implications for Practice**

In the current study, the researcher developed and examined the effectiveness of a group intervention designed to promote bicultural development among youth. Within the current version of the East West Connection, the researcher dedicated an equal
amount of session time to psychoeducation and experiential activities. However, traditional classroom lecture appeared to have limited effectiveness on participants’ learning. Thus, in focusing on the development of bicultural development with youth, it is important for practitioners to include experiential activities to engage youth and to offer opportunities to practice bicultural skills during each session. Each session should also include group discussions.

The author developed a four-week curriculum to use in the present study to address time constraints. However, when feasible, the author recommends increase the curriculum length to extend beyond a four-week model, which would allow the inclusion of a wider range of acculturation topics. The current version of the East West Connection was limited to focusing on three areas: school, family, and acculturation stress. It is conceivable that the curriculum would be more effective by focusing on a wider range of acculturation topics, including family cultural adaptation, worries that family members have for each other, cultural dissonance at home and school, coping with discrimination at school and work, and strengthen relationship with members of both EAA and non-EAA.

The size of the group is also a consideration. The researcher recommends limiting the group size to six to eight students, when feasible. Alternatively, practitioners may have divide youth into small groups that are led by a team of group facilitators. This was the initial plan for the current study. However, due to time constraints and limited available co-facilitators, the author conducted the curriculum as a large group format. Smaller groups may allow for more meaningful discussion and focus (Gladding, 2012). Furthermore, it may be more beneficial to limit the range of participants to high school
age adolescents (15 – 18-year-old), as they have already begun considering the meaningfulness of their culture in their lives, and are likely to have begun developing an ethnic group consciousness (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). As such, it may be more relevant for later adolescents to explore and consider the themes of identity and culture, and the roles of both in their lives.

In further considering counseling practice, scholars have hypothesized that many presenting issues are potentially linked to culture and acculturative stressors (e.g., an adolescent client who experiences disagreement in his family related to decision-making in selecting a college). In the past, practitioners attempted to modify counseling approaches and interventions to become culturally-sensitive to EAA clients (Epstein et al., 2012; Lee & Mjelde-Mossey, 2004). As demonstrated in the current study, promoting biculturalism can be a viable counseling approach to promoting well-being in EAA youth and families.

Another recommendation for counseling practice is for mental health providers to routinely assess EAA clients’ level of acculturation, and how it may be affecting their well-being and adjustments. Through assessing which acculturation strategy EAA clients present with (i.e., separation, marginalization, integration, or assimilation), clinicians can identify the risk and resilience of EAA clients, which can lead to using appropriate and culturally-responsive treatments. Practitioners can adopt and modify the activities of the East West Connection Curriculum with EAA adolescent and family clients. For example, the Make a Meme activity may assist counselors with identifying the client’s significant relationships and level of acculturation. Finally, counselors can explore with EAA clients the role of cultural value conflicts, and how this may be related
to their presenting issues. Scholars have proposed different ways of modifying existing counseling practices to become more culturally-responsive to the needs of EAA clients (Epstein et al., 2014; Lee & Mjelde-Mossey, 2004). However, there is still a need for evidence-based counseling practices that are culturally appropriate for working with EAA clients. Because acculturation and cultural identity issues are relevant elements that are linked to EAA youth’s well-being, it is important for practitioners to integrate these variables in counseling practices.

**Conclusion**

As the U.S. has become more diverse, it is apparent that multicultural responsive counseling is essential. Yet, there continues to be a significant knowledge gap concerning the acculturation experiences and development of EAA children and adolescents in the counseling literature (Chu & Sue, 2011). The current study was an attempt to close the knowledge gap.

Cultural integration is the preferred acculturation strategy by immigrant individuals and families from primarily collectivist cultures of origin. Smokowski and Bacallao (2005; 2009; 2011) found that the promotion of biculturalism in Latino immigrant youth reduced problem behaviors and increased family cohesion. The author attempted to examine whether bicultural identity would predict positive adjustment and well-being among EAA adolescents. Although the current study did not yield statistically significant findings, it did point out the challenges that EAA youth experiences with identity development, acculturation dissonance, and discrimination experiences. Development and refinement of bicultural skills training programs are important steps in providing EAA youth with support, knowledge, and skills for healthy adjustment and mental health well-being.
APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

PARENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

to Parents of Participate in Research

Title of this study: East meets West: Developing a Bicultural Identity in East Asian American Youth

Researchers: Christopher Cheung, MS Ed.

I seek your consent to enroll your child/children in the current study.

Purpose of the research study:
The current research aims to study the intersection of culture and identity and its effect on East Asian American (EAA) youth’s well-being and development. Specifically, I hypothesize that bicultural identity development is associated with positive mental health well-being in EAA youth.

What you will be asked to do in the study:
I will be implementing a four-week curriculum, and asks your permission to include your child(ren) in the study. Your child(ren) will participate in a four-week psycho-education group, and will complete two questionnaires (both in the beginning and at the end of the curriculum).

Time required:
The four sessions will take place over four weeks, and each session is approximately 60 minutes.

Risks and Benefits:
I anticipate that the current study will have minimal risks to participants. Participants may experience some discomfort or feelings of nervousness during group discussions. Sharing of personal information may create discomfort between group members. However, I will ensure that group members know that participation in such discussion is voluntary. Participants may choose to not participate or discontinue their participation in the study at any time without consequences. While there are no immediate benefits to the study participants, the findings may contribute to advancing the field of counseling and supervision.

Compensation:
You and your child(ren) will not receive any compensation for participating in this study.

How your study records will be maintained and who will have access:
Participants will complete a questionnaire package (73-items). The responses will be entered into a password protected computer, where only myself (Primary Investigator) will have access. Participants will be de-identified through assigning each participant a number that will be matched to their responses. Participant’s confidentiality are protected under the guidelines according to the code of ethics of the American Counseling Association (ACA), and the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT).

Confidentiality
Participant’s identity will be kept confidential in accordance with the code of ethics of ACA and AAMFT. Researchers will take appropriate steps to protect any information they collect about each participant. This includes, participant’s data will be electronically recorded on a password protected laptop which only the Primary Investigator will have access to. If the results of this research are published or presented at scientific meetings, participant’s identity will not be disclosed.

Voluntary participation:
Your child(ren)’s participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to enroll your child(ren) in this study or you have the right to withdraw your child(ren) from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
You may contact Mr. Christopher Cheung at cheung.c28@gmail.com or faculty mentor, Jacqueline Swank, Ph.D., at jswank@coe.ufl.edu any time if you have questions about the research.

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
IRB02 Office, PO Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250, Phone: (352) – 392-0433.

Signing this document means that you have read the above description and voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this description.

I give consent for my child(ren)’s participation in the current study ____________________________ Date __________________________
Thank you all for being here tonight. My name is Christopher Cheung, a doctoral student at the University of Florida. As you may know, I am trying to implement a new program that focuses on EAA adolescent development. Specifically, I would like to learn about how identity and culture work together affecting the well-being of EAA youth. This program will consist of four group sessions, each lasting about 90 minutes. You will be asked to complete a set of questionnaires now and at the end of four weeks, which will take about 10 – 20 minutes each time. You may also be asked to participate in group activities for four sessions. Information collected about you will be decoded, so that nobody else will know how you answered the questions. In order for me to match your first and last set of questionnaire, I will assign you a number/code-name. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you will not have any negative consequences for not participating or withdrawing from this study.

During the sessions or activities, you may experience some nervousness or distress. Please know that your participation is entirely voluntary and that you don’t have to share information about yourself or your family if you do not want to. Again, you may withdraw from the study at any time. If you do experience feelings of distress or anxiety, please let me or one of the leaders know (e.g., youth group leader, youth pastor), so that we can help address it. Now that I have explained the purpose of the study, I will take this time to answer any questions or comments you may have related to this study. All I need from you is a verbal “yes” or “no” if you like to be part of this study. If you do agree to it, I will note your agreement on this list.
APPENDIX C
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, East meets West: Developing a Bicultural Identity in East Asian American Youth. The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information about you to help the researcher better understand and conceptualize your responses. Please fill these questions out to the best of your ability.

1. Your Gender (please circle one):
   - Female
   - Male
   - Other (please describe): _____________

2. Your Age: _____

3. Ethnicity:
   - Chinese
   - Korean
   - Mix Asian
   - I consider myself: ______________

4. Your Grade (please circle one):
   - 6th
   - 7th
   - 8th
   - 9th
   - 10th
   - 11th
   - 12th

5. List the family relationships who are currently living in the same home as you
   - ________________
   - ________________
   - ________________
   - ________________
   - ________________
   - ________________

Of the people you listed above, circle the parents or primary caretakers.
APPENDIX D
EAST WEST CONNECTION: BICULTURAL TRAINING CURRICULUM MANUAL

East West Connection: Bicultural Training Curriculum

Purpose: The East-West Connection (EWC) is an educational curriculum which aims to raise awareness about the cultural factors that affect East Asian American (EAA) youth’s experiences. They will also learn how to navigate the through complexities of cultural identity development. Through developing bicultural knowledge and skills, EAA adolescents can better relate with members of the Asian and American individuals and develop a bicultural identity.

Format: Guided Discussion, activities

Length: 4 weekly sessions

Duration: approximately 60 minutes per session

Group Size: 10 – 20 participants per group

Age: 12 – 17

Target Population: East Asian American youth of immigrant families

SESSION OUTLINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Asian or American: Growing up in the U.S. as an Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Identity and Culture: Who am I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>When East meets West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Review, Integrate, and Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer: This manual is used in conjunction with the curriculum’s training. Training is provided to anyone interested in conducting this curriculum. Group facilitators may tailor the content according to the specific needs of the participants. For more information, contact Christopher Cheung at cheung.c28@ufl.edu.

Introduction

In human development, adolescence is a period where any individual experiences physiological and psychological changes. Generally, the individual grows taller, changes in vocal tones, and develops higher level cognitive abilities (e.g. perspective taking, abstract thinking). Adolescents experiences many physical changes while simultaneously are confronted with the task of developing an identity.

This identity development process is filled with different existential questions in order to figure out their purpose in life, and how they can achieve such purpose. As East Asian American (EAA) adolescents, culture becomes an important part of this identity development process. EAA youth face the unique challenge of balancing the U.S. American and the East Asian culture worlds. Regardless if the individual immigrated to the U.S. or was born in the U.S., they share similar challenges growing up as an EAA individual. Not only is the task to understand what it means to be East Asian living in the U.S., but understanding history, society, and family immigration, and language all play a role in influencing how the individual begin to make sense of him/herself.
Session 1: Asian or American: Growing up in the U.S. as an East Asian teen

Overview of the Session: The goal of the first session is to orient participants to the East-West Connection curriculum. The group facilitator will provide an overview of the structure of the curriculum and also discuss how participants are expected to be involved. The first task for the group is to establish group norms, such as confidentiality, respect for other participants, among other group behaviors. The group facilitator must establish these rules before engaging in any of the listed activities below. After ensuring that all participants understand and agreed to the group norms, the group facilitator will lead them in an icebreaker activity.

Warm-up Activity (20 minutes): “Getting to Know You Bingo”.

Instructions: Participants are given a card with various statements. The aim of the game is to collect signatures from other people in the group for all the statements. The participants will need to walk around the room, and ask other people if they can say yes to one of the statements. The activity ends when one participant successfully covered all the squares with signatures or when time expires (20-minute game)

Presentation discussion (20 minutes): The presentation focuses on the history of EAAs in the U.S. and how these historical events influence the experiences of today’s EAA youth cultural development. The main highlights are:

- The historical context of the early EAA immigrants
- The Model Minority Stereotype
- Modern racialization (e.g. EAA stereotypes, invisibility, portrayed in media etc.)

Group Discussion (10 minutes): Divide participants into groups of 2 or 3. In smaller groups, participants will discuss the following prompts:

- Was this information new to you? Discuss what stood out to you
- What is your personal experience with the Model Minority Stereotype?
- How does hearing about the historical context change the way you view yourself being a member of the EAA community?
- How do you see things have changed for the better for EAA?
- Are there anything else that you like to see different in the way the U.S. society views EAA?

Facilitator Note: The group facilitator should visit each small group, and provide further clarification or feedback about their group conversations. The facilitator can elaborate on the discussion points if any small groups feel stuck. Depending on participants’ comfort level with each other, some may not feel comfortable discussing the prompts. In this case, the facilitator should encourage the participants to only answer the first two prompts.

After 10 minutes, the groups will reconvene. As a large group, they are given the opportunities to share what they learned from each other.

Review and closing (5 minutes):

1. Restate the purpose and goals of the EWC.
2. Review historical influences on EAA cultural development.
**Assigned Task:** Challenge participants to reflect on the meaning of being EAA, between now and next session

**Session 2: Who Am I?**

**Overview of the Session:** During adolescence, one of the most popular buzzword that is often associated with teenagers is *identity*. But what is identity? How do you define identity? Merriam-Webster dictionary (n.d.) defines identity as the qualities, beliefs, etc., that make a particular person or group different from others. This definition comprises of an interesting contradiction. Namely, identity helps the individual find belonging, and at the same time separating oneself from others. Take a moment and think through about your own identity. According to researchers, adolescence is a critical period for developing the foundational elements of this core identity (Erikson, 1963). Throughout life, your identity will change due to new demands or you reach a new milestone in life. At the same time, there is still a foundational sense of self, or identity.

In session two, the goal is to raise awareness about cultural influences and how those affect participants’ cultural identities. The facilitator will compare both cultures, and discuss the implicit cultural values that affects thoughts and behaviors. It is important that the lesson not only highlights the differences, but also focus on common values and beliefs both cultures share, such as support and well-being for all family members.

**Review Assigned take home task (5 minutes)**

**Warm-up Activity (10 minutes):** *The Culture*. Participants will all stand in a single file in the middle of the room while facing forward. The group facilitator will read aloud 10 statements. Participants will take a step to the left, right, or stay in their spot depending on what the statements asks.

**Presentation (20 minutes):** The presentation will compare and contrast East Asian culture and U.S. American culture. Participants will learn how cultural values affect behaviors and worldviews. The group will also learn about the acculturation and how it affects well-being.

- Cultural differences: *East Asian* and *U.S. American values and beliefs*
- The influences of culture in values, behaviors, and worldviews
- Acculturation Stress
- Mix messages (e.g., assertive or self-restraint)

**Activity (30 min):** “*Who People Think I Am*” – Meme maker

**Instructions:** Create four to six separate boxes on a large poster. Under each box, you will label the following four to six titles

1. “How my friends think I am”
2. “How others think I am” (optional)
3. “How my parents think I am”
4. “How my teachers think I am” (optional)
5. “How I like to think I am”
6. “How I really am”

In each of the boxes they will hand draw or use magazine cutouts to illustrate different identities that they may possess. Each person selects 3 different identities to share with the group
Facilitator Note: Create an example as demonstration for the group.

Group Discussion (5 minutes): Divide the group into smaller groups of two or three members, and together they will address the following discussion points:
- What, if any, are some similarities and differences between the way your parents raised you compared to your non-Asian peers? How did you make sense of any differences or no differences?
- How do you think an EAA should be? What are some of the messages you receive about how you should behave or think?
- What are some mix messages, both explicit and implicit ones, about how you should think and behave? What are some other mix messages you can think of?

Review and closing (5 minutes):
- Review cultural values and worldviews.
- Review why it is important to become aware of the cultural influences.

Assigned Task: Encourage participants to share their meme with their respective families, between now and the next session.

Session 3: When East Meets West

Overview of session: As we reach the climax of the curriculum, it is finally time to develop bicultural competence. In truth, participants already gained some competency with regards to bicultural knowledge. By now, participants should have a basic understanding of the sociohistorical context of the U.S. in relation to EAA. In the first session, participants learned about the history of Asian racialization, and how that shaped today’s milieu in how EAA are viewed (Zhou & Lee, 2004). In the second session, participants learned about the differences in cultural frames between the East Asian culture and U.S. American culture, and the challenge of navigating between both cultural norms. 

In the current session, participants will learn to translate the bicultural knowledge into bicultural skills, specifically developing competence in interpersonal communication. Through the presentation and the activity, participants will learn to identify cultural values imbedded in every day interactions with members of the U.S. and East Asian culture, and learn to respond in a culturally-sensitive manner.

Warm-up Activity (5 minutes): “Grandma or Nai-Nai” – For this activity, participants will draw their family tree and name each family member by their family title.

Presentation (15 minutes): Participants will learn about the concept of bicultural identity, and how to begin developing a bicultural identity. The presentation will focus on:
- Interpersonal communication
  - Cultural differences in power distance, hierarchy, and direct vs. indirect communication.
- Culture exploration
  - Participating in cultural holidays
  - Be curious about Asian history
- Communication
  - Direct and indirect communication
Power distance communication

- Conflict Management:
  - Video What Asian Parents Don’t Say (3:25 minutes)
  - Assertiveness and deference
  - Learn to be respectful in disagreements (do’s and don’ts)
  - Coping with acculturation dissonance and intergenerational conflict.

**Activity and Group Discussion** (30 minutes): Bicultural Skills Building

Participants will describe what the

Participants are divided into smaller groups (3 or 4 person small groups). Each group is given a set of words that are related to a communication or parenting style. In their respective groups, the members will work together to identify which the words are associated with Asian, American, or both cultures.

**Review** (5 minutes):
- Review cultural communication
- Review cultural exploration

**Assigned Task:** Encourage participants to use the bicultural skills they learned, to resolve any culturally-based issues they may encounter between now and next session.

**Session 4: Review, Integrate, and Closing**

While identity development differs for each individual, the EWC aims to build a starting point for the participants to begin exploring what it means to be EAA. For 1.5 generation youth, this would mean to become open to accommodating to the U.S. culture, while retaining their cultural sense of self. For second-generation youth, who are often more acculturated than their parents and other immigrant adults, they should learn to be more curious about their culture of origin. In essence, it is possible for an individual to become competent in multiple cultural norms. As the adolescent grow older, and continues to grow in their bicultural skills and knowledge, he/she will eventually develop an integrated identity; feeling comfortable in both cultures.

The current session is the culmination of all that the teens have learned throughout the EWC. In this final meeting, participants will use their skills and knowledge to problem-solve. The order of

**Review Assigned Task**

**Warm-up Activity** (10 minutes): Cross-Cultural Communication Activity (Deardorff, 2003)

**Instruction:** Prepare two sets of directions for participants, and shuffle them. Place the cards face down on the table. Each participant will select one card from the pile, then read and follow the instructions. After 10 minutes are up, debrief the group with the prompts.

**Facilitator Note:** If possible, simulate a party atmosphere by providing food and drinks. Participants may interact with each other, as if they are at a small party.

**Activity** (30 minutes): What would you do? – Case Studies
**Instructions**: Participants will be separated into groups of three, and each group will receive a case vignette. Each case vignette comprises of a cultural problem an EAA adolescent is facing. The small groups will discuss the case and develop solutions. The facilitator can modify or add more scenarios according to group size.

**Facilitator Note**: If there is enough time, each small group may reenact the scenario. This depends on participants' developmental level as well, as younger members may not be willing to act out the scenario. *See Appendix for the vignettes*

**Closing** (10 minutes):
- Review the EWC content

The final session will close with participants share what insights they have gained throughout the EWC. They may use a one word take-away or share about one specific activity they really enjoyed.
LESSON CONTENTS

Session 1: Asian or American: Growing up in the U.S. as an Asian American
Warm-up Activity:

Name:

GETTING TO KNOW YOU BINGO

Find the person who fits the following description, and have him/her sign in that box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plays Piano</th>
<th>Born in October</th>
<th>Can order Chinese/Korean food in Chinese/Korean</th>
<th>Knows how to skateboard</th>
<th>Has ridden a horse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born in another country</td>
<td>Visited more than 3 US States</td>
<td>Can sing the US National Anthem (Must sing in front of you)</td>
<td>Has a library card</td>
<td>Has a six-letter last name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has never gotten a C in a test</td>
<td>Is Part of a School Club</td>
<td>Can write his/her name in two or three different languages</td>
<td>Watches Disney Channel at least once a day</td>
<td>Owns a pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can list the alphabet backwards (Must do it in front of you)</td>
<td>Knows how to cook (Names do not count)</td>
<td>Has a favorite sports team</td>
<td>Has an aunt that lives in a different part of the U.S.</td>
<td>Is on Team Valor (Pokémon Go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has three or more brothers or sisters</td>
<td>Celebrates Chinese/Korean holidays</td>
<td>Read the whole Harry Potter Series (not including the new ones)</td>
<td>Fell asleep in class one time</td>
<td>Watches Chinese/Korean shows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation Content:

The early Asian immigrants in the U.S. had hopes of making a quick fortune before returning back to their country of origin. However, the first Asian immigrants faced numerous hardships including legal exclusions and racial segregation up until the late 1960’s (Chun, 2004). A significant event that occurred in 1949 was the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and China’s affiliation with communism. As a consequence, Chinese immigrants and Chinese Americans, alike, were associated with communism (Polenberg, 1980). During this period, U.S. Americans considered communism a threat to the welfare of the nation. As fear and intolerance of anyone associated with communism grew within the U.S., hostile treatment against Asian Americans increased. Many Asian Americans, especially Chinese Americans, thought the best way to ease the hostile treatment from Americans was to renounce any ties they had with their culture of origin, and pledge their loyalty to the U.S. (Chun, 2004). While the movement to assimilate partially achieved its goal in lessening the concerns of many U.S. Americans, it led to later generation Asian Americans to hold a negative attitude towards their Asian culture of origin (Zhou & Lee, 2004).
Today, the U.S. has become more conscious and understanding of cultural diversity which has led to the abolishment of discriminatory laws and practices. However, the racialization of EAA continues to exist in the U.S., albeit in subtle forms. Mainstream media portrays EAA youth as a homogenized social group consisting of either the foreign others or geniuses. Moreover, EAA were perceived as model minorities who showed the lowest instances of mental health problems, while achieving academic and financial success (Le, 2016; Lee & Zhou, 2004). Contrary to this widespread belief, approximately 17.3% of Asian Americans in the U.S. experience one or more mental health disorders in their lifetime (Takeuchi et al., 2007), are also the least likely to seek professional mental health services (Yeh et al., 2003), and the expectation of academic geniuses create undue pressure for many EAA (Le, 2016). These false perceptions of EAA, as a minority group with few problems and attaining more success, has long reaching consequences for EAA youth.

**Model Minority.** A notable example of racialization is the “Model Minority” (Thompson et al., 2016). This stereotype depicts EAA as the exemplary minority group in the U.S., who are smart, submissive, obedient, and self-reliant, and that through hard work and perseverance can achieve success in the U.S. (Lim, 2015). The origins of the MMS started in the 1960s during the time of the civil rights movement. According to Zhou and Lee (2004), “the model minority stereotype serves to buttress the myth that the United States is a country devoid of racism, and one that accords equal opportunities for all who take the initiative to work hard to get ahead” (p. 18). While this appears to be a positive portrayal of EAA, the MMS has harmful consequences for EAA.

First, the MMS contributed to the exclusion of Asian American in research studies (Hunt et al., 2011; Zhou & Lee, 2004). This was primarily due the low report of social and psychological problems among the EAA population as compared to other minority groups (Zhou & Lee, 2004). Contrary to this belief, Asian Americans experience similar difficulties as other minorities (i.e., poverty and mental health issues); however, many of these issues are underreported (Sung, et al., 2013; Wu, 2014). Second, while MMS is an attempt to laud the achievements of Asian Americans, it also serves to blame other minority groups for not trying hard enough to succeed (Zhou & Lee, 2004). The result becomes such that “not only does the image thwart other racial/ethnic minorities’ demands for social justice, it also pits minority groups against each other” (p. 18). The MMS continues to exist in subtler forms. In their review of recent literature on MMS, Thompson and colleagues? (2016) found that Asian Americans still reported feeling unfairly perceived as academic overachieving, reserved, and soft-spoken.

**Session 2: Who Am I?**

Warmup-Activity Prompts:
The statements are as following:
1. If you are born in the U.S. take one step to the left, if not take one step to the right
2. If you speak mainly English with your family, take a step to the left. If you speak mainly Chinese/Korean at home, take a step to the right.
3. If you rather have hamburgers, pizza, pasta, or salad for dinner, take a step to the left. If you rather have Chinese/Korean food, take a step to the right. If you don’t have any preference stay where you are.

4. If you prefer American media (music, television shows, or video games), take a step to the left. If you prefer Chinese/Korean media (music, television, or video games), take a step to the right.

5. If you are part of a sports club, take a step to the left. If you are taking music lessons, take a step to the right. If you do both, stay where you are.

6. If you ever traveled to China, Hong-Kong, Taiwan, or Korea, take a step to the right.

7. If you ever felt pressured by your family to be more Chinese/Korean, take a step to the right, otherwise take a step to the left.

8. If you ever felt ashamed or inferior to be associated with your Chinese/Korean ethnicity/culture, take a step to the left. If not stand still.

9. If you ever felt more comfortable with people of the Chinese/Korean settings than in non-Asian settings, take a step to the right.

10. If you ever felt that you’ve been stereotyped as a math genius, a talented musician, a quiet and passive person, or only eats weird food, take a step to the right.

**Presentation Content:**

**East Asian culture.** Unique to East Asian American’s experience is the contrast between adherence to their East Asian and the U.S. cultural norms. The East Asian culture is deeply rooted in the social and ethical philosophy according to Confucian teachings (Ng, 1999; Wu & Chao, 2005, 2011). Succinctly, Confucian teaching emphasizes harmony, community, order, patriarchy, and traditions (Park & Kim, 2008). These cultural values influence how one understands the self, as well as guide the individual’s way of thinking and behaving (Ng, 1999).

Confucian teachings emphasize *self-restraint* or *self-control*, which includes controlling one’s emotions and behaviors (Lieber, Fung, & Leung, 2006). Individual wishes are often suppressed or delayed in order to meet the needs of others, especially family members. Next, is the concept of *filial piety*. Filial piety refers to the duty, respect, and obligations to one’s family, and to always put the wishes of one’s family before one’s own wants and needs (Ikels, 2004). The cultural practices that express filial piety include veneration of elders, deference to those who are older, loyalty to the family, upholding the family name, and support to children through their academics. Families are responsible for teaching these cultural practices to their children so that when they become parents, they will do the same for their children.

**U.S. culture.** In contrast to East Asian culture, the U.S. culture emphasizes individualism (Hofstede, 1984). Some characteristics of individualist values include self-sufficiency, personal autonomy, privacy, uniqueness, initiative, and individual achievements (Darwish, 2003). Individuals from individualistic cultures prioritize independence and personal goals over the well-being of the community or group (Coon, 2001). Families have a crucial role in teaching children decision-making skills so that they can become independent and self-sufficient adults later in life. For example, in the
U.S., when a teenager reaches the age of 18, he or she is recognized as an adult and expected to be independent and self-sufficient. East Asian culture emphasizes values that are different from U.S. American cultural norms and values. When confronted with situations where adherence to one cultural norms goes against the values of the other set of cultural norms, immigrant youth report feeling ‘caught between two cultures’ (Giguére et al., 2010; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Fortunately, youth find creative ways to resolve these cultural challenges. Most notably, Fuligni and Tsai (2015) noted that immigrant and second-generation individuals develop a hybridized or flexible identity, while also avoid being categorized as belonging to one or the other culture. However, how an individual develops an integrated East Asian and U.S. cultural identity, is not well understood (Ahn et al., 2008; Schwartz et al., 2013).

Show Video: Growing up Asian (3:31 minutes)

Acculturation, which refers to the individual-level psychological changes as they adapt to their new country of settlement with new cultural norms (Berry, 2005). The adaptation process includes behavioral changes, such as types of food consumed or language spoken, and psychological changes, such as goals and beliefs (Berry, 1997; 2005). There are a number of factors that influence the process of acculturation, including the disparity between the culture of origin and the mainstream culture, how supportive the receiving society is to foreigners, and the age of immigration (de Anda, 1984; Schwartz & Unger, 2010). Therefore, the acculturation experience differs for each individual. John Berry (1997) proposes four main acculturation strategy:

1. **Separation** acculturation strategy refers to immigrant individuals resisting the influences of the dominant culture, and instead maintain heritage cultural practices, values, and identity (Berry, 1997).
2. **Assimilation** is characterized by embracing the receiving culture while abandoning one’s culture-of-origin (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993).
3. **Marginalization**, also known as deculturation or cultural homelessness, refers to a state in which an immigrant fails to develop a cultural identity and does not feel affiliation with either the heritage or the dominant culture (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993).
4. **Integration**, also known as biculturalism, refers to maintaining the heritage cultural integrity while accommodating to the dominant cultural norms (Berry, 1997; LaFromboise et al., 1993).

Positive reasons for bicultural development:
- Immigrant parents (8:32 minutes)

**Session 3: When East meets West**

Warm up Activity Answer: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A1HaZ4WLo50

**Presentation Content:**

Integration and well-being. Since assimilation does not appear to be a viable acculturation strategy, alternation theory might be more appropriate for immigrants from non-Western cultures. LaFromboise and colleagues (1993) contended that individuals
using the integration strategy demonstrate cultural competence in both cultures. They outlined the following criteria as important aspects in being culturally competent: (a) having a strong personal identity, (b) possessing knowledge of the beliefs and values of the culture, (c) being sensitive to the affective processes of the culture, (d) being able to communicate in the language of the cultural group, (e) demonstrating socially appropriate behaviors, (f) interacting within the cultural group, and (g) functioning within the institutional structure of a culture (LaFromboise et al., 1993). Therefore, a bicultural competent individual, as a result of living in two cultures, demonstrates these criteria for both the receiving and heritage cultures. Bicultural individuals internalize their heritage and receiving cultures and are able to access the resources from both in guiding their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Schwartz & Unger, 2010). They can proficiently operate between the two cultural systems, modifying their behaviors and thoughts appropriately according to the cultural task without compromising their sense of cultural identity. Cultural researchers also reported that individuals who view the two (or more) cultural streams as compatible and integrate both cultures demonstrate emotional stability, openness to new experiences, and advanced cognitive reasoning (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Tadmore & Tetlock, 2006).

**Communication Ability.** The interpersonal style of relating to one another, especially in significant relationships, is an area where cultural differences become apparent (Rhee, Chang, & Rhee, 2003; Santilli & Miller, 2011). The Asian culture is generally characterized by high power-distance and indirect interpersonal style of relating with others (Adler, Rosenfeld, & Proctor, 2015). In other words, there are clear hierarchical boundaries between individuals that are potentially based on age, social class, occupation, gender, or other factors. Moreover, communication is less direct with lower use of assertive and dramatic styles (Park & Kim, 2008). Children raised in high power-distance cultures are obligated to obey their parents and authority figures in an almost unquestioning manner, and they often communicate disagreements in an indirect manner. In contrast, individualist cultures, such as the U.S., are classified as adopting a low power-distance and direct interpersonal style (Rhee et al., 2003). Generally, U.S. Americans believe in minimizing power differentials when interacting with one another, believing that one person is as good as the next regardless of social status or position. It is also acceptable to challenge authority or question the status quo directly (Park & Kim, 2008). For example, it is acceptable for students to question or to speak in an informal way with school teachers. Children who grow up in a low power-distance culture also do not have the expectation of unquestioning obedience to their parents (Park & Kim, 2008). Instead, parents socialize youth to ask for compromises, such as negotiating for responsibilities or an increase in allowance. The U.S. American society considers the effort to decrease social power differences as normal in interacting with others (Adler, Rosenfeld, & Proctor, 2015). Thus, EAAs would perceive the interpersonal style of U.S. Americans as rude and disrespectful, while U.S. Americans view the style of EAA as strict and inflexible (Li, 2011; Rhee et al., 2003).

EAA youth are confronted by many culturally-based challenges, which they must resolve in order to achieve a sense of identity (Schwartz et al., 2009; 2015b; Smokowski & Bacallao, 2011). Based on Erikson’s (1956) psychosocial developmental theory and cultural identity theory (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2007; 2013;
Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014) an achieved identity is associated with positive mental health well-being. Similar to Erikson’s (1963; 1968) assertion that individuals must successfully resolve the psychosocial crisis in order to establish a personal identity, minority adolescents must successfully resolve acculturation challenges in order to achieve a cultural identity. Conversely, failure to develop a sense of self can lead to a state of cultural identity confusion (Berry & Kim, 1988; Erikson, 1956).

Examples of High and Low Power Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Power Distance</th>
<th>Low Power Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students rarely challenge teacher’s lessons</td>
<td>• Student can initiate communication with teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking turns speaking, usually beginning with the oldest to the youngest</td>
<td>• Boss asks employees for opinions and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expecting the teacher to set goals for students</td>
<td>• Youth have a right to state their own ideas or opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indirect communication</td>
<td>• Can speak out of turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opinions of experts and elders are valued</td>
<td>• Student set own goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with adults in decision-making</td>
<td>• Direct communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Younger person must respect older person, whether deserved or not</td>
<td>• Self-reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage a first-name basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students can challenge teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session 4: Becoming Bicultural

Warm-Up Activity: Case Studies

- **Case Study 1**: Ben is a 16-year old male and second-generation Korean living in the Broward, FL area. He was a typical student, and enjoys what most teens do for fun (playing video games, reading manga, playing guitar). While he’s very outgoing and social, one area Ben has never liked to talk about is his family. Ben shared that he doesn’t know if his parents truly cared about him. He felt that his parents only cares about Ben’s school work. “My parents never hug me or compliment me. The only thing I ever hear is how great Mrs. Oh’s (family friend) daughter got accepted to Cornell, and how I am wasting away my life.” Ben also feel embarrassed by his parent’s behaviors at times. He shared, “I don’t understand why they are such penny-pinchers. We’re not poor, but we sure live like we are. They don’t get me new clothes or shoes until my current ones are worn. Even then, my mom would only look for discounted items.” Instead, Ben was envious of his non-Asian friends, who seem to be getting a lot of support and warmth from their parents. “Their parents always compliment how hard they work even if they get a B- for a test. Not my parents though. I must constantly hear them nag that I won’t be able to go to a good college and get a good job. Why is everything about getting a good job?”
What are the factors that affects Ben’s relationship with his parents?
Which factors are related to culture, and how does that impact Ben’s view of his parents?
What do you think Ben’s idea is of good parenting?
What do you think the parent’s idea is of good parenting?
How would you help Ben or his parents, if they come to you for advice?

Case Study 2: Sandy is a 17-year old female, the oldest child out of the four children, and a second-generation immigrant of Korean heritage. Because her family values their heritage culture a lot, Sandy has some proficiency in the Korean language. However, she still prefers to communicate in English in general. Sandy is an excellent student, and has represented her school well. Naturally, her teachers and the school principle takes notice of this, and encouraged Sandy to apply to Harvard. While Sandy’s parents are proud of her achievement, they know very little about the colleges in the United States. They believe that the local University of Miami is just as good, and does not understand why Sandy needs to move far away from the family. As Sandy’s high school years are coming to an end, conversation about picking a university becomes more frequent. At school, teachers are talking about scholarships and live in Massachusetts. At home, Sandy’s parents are encouraging her to apply to any local universities.

What sort of pressure may Sandy be experiencing?
What do you believe Sandy’s teachers may be thinking? What might her teacher not understand about your East Asian culture?
How can you articulate Sandy parents’ concerns? In other words, what do you believe her parents are worried about?

Case Study 3: Jack is a 17-year-old, second-generation Chinese American, and the middle child of three boys. After returning from a recent short-term mission’s trip to Bolivia, Jack felt a strong desire to pursue a career as a missionary. However, Jack's parents were not pleased with this decision. Instead, his parents want Jack to go to college and pursue a career in medicine, law, business, or pharmacy. Jack was confused by his parent’s reaction because they had always encouraged him to become involved with the church group. Since Jack is about to graduate from high-school, he has to make a decision soon whether to attend seminary or a university.

What do you think are some of the reasons why the parents wanted Jack to go to college?
What are would NOT be the correct way for Jack to respond to his parents?
What is your advice to Jack in dealing with this dilemma?
APPENDIX E
BICULTURAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (BSES)

INSTRUCTIONS:
Please answer each statement as carefully as possible. Please circle ONE of the numbers to the right of each statement to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can count on both mainstream Americans and people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can communicate my ideas effectively to both mainstream Americans and the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have generally positive feelings about both my heritage culture and mainstream American culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am knowledgeable about the history of both mainstream America and my cultural group.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can develop new relationships with both mainstream Americans as well as people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is acceptable for an individual from my heritage culture to participate in two different cultures.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can communicate my feelings effectively to both mainstream Americans and people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am knowledgeable about the values important to mainstream American as well as to my cultural group.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel comfortable attending a gathering of mostly mainstream Americans as well as a gathering</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of mostly people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. An individual can alter his or her behavior to fit a particular social context.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have a generally positive attitude toward both mainstream Americans and my cultural group.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is acceptable for a mainstream American individual to participate in two different cultures.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have strong ties with mainstream Americans as well as people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am proficient in both standard English and the language of my heritage culture (e.g., urban street talk, Spanish, etc.).</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I can choose the degree and manner by which I affiliate with each culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am knowledgeable about the gender roles and expectations of both mainstream Americans and my cultural group.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel at ease around both mainstream Americans and people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have respect for both mainstream American culture and my heritage culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Being bicultural does not mean I have to compromise my sense of cultural identity.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I can switch easily between standard English and the language of my heritage culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I have an extensive network of mainstream Americans as well as an extensive network of people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I take pride in both the mainstream American culture and my heritage culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am confident that I can learn new aspects of both the mainstream American culture and my heritage culture.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>It is possible for an individual to have a sense of belonging in two cultures without compromising his or her sense of cultural identity.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the holidays celebrated both by mainstream Americans and by my cultural group.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I feel like I fit in when I am with mainstream Americans as well as people from the same heritage culture as myself.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Christopher! Thank you for your interest in my work! Of course you may use the BSES. Good luck with your dissertation and I look forward to hearing about your findings.

Best,

EJ

On Wed, Jul 6, 2016 at 1:17 PM, Cheung Christopher W <cheung.c28@ufl.edu> wrote:

Greetings Dr. David,

I hope all is well with you.

My name is Christopher Cheung, doctoral candidate from the University of Florida. I am in the process of developing my dissertation study, which is focused on investigating Bicultural Identity Development in Asian American youth, and through my literature review came across the BSE scale that you and your colleagues developed. I would like to ask for your permission to use the scale in my research.
APPENDIX F
ASIAN AMERICAN MULTIDIMENSIONAL ACCULTURATION SCALE (AAMAS)

Instructions: Use the scale below to answer the following questions. Please circle the number that best represents your view on each item. Please note that reference to “Asian” hereafter refers to Asians in America and not Asia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How well do speak the language of --
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. English? 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. How well do you understand the language of --
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. English? 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. How well do you read and write in the language of --
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. English? 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. How often do you listen to music or look at movies and magazines from
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. the White mainstream groups? 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. How much do you like the food of -
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. the White mainstream groups? 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. How often do you eat the food of -
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. the White mainstream groups? 1 2 3 4 5 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How <strong>knowledgeable</strong> are you about the history of -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How <strong>knowledgeable</strong> are you about the culture and traditions of -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How much do you <strong>practice</strong> the traditions and keep the holidays of -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian American cultures?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream culture?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How much <strong>do you identify with</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How much do you feel <strong>you have in common with</strong> people from -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How much <strong>do you interact and associate with</strong> people from -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>How much <strong>would you like to</strong> interact and associate with people from -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>your own Asian culture of origin?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>other Asian groups in America?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>the White mainstream groups?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **How proud are you to be part of -**
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6
   c. the White mainstream groups? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6

*15. **How negative do you feel about people from -**
   a. your own Asian culture of origin? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6
   b. other Asian groups in America? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6
   c. the White mainstream groups? | 1 2 | 3 4 5 6
Re: Permission to use the AAMAS

ruth.chung7@gmail.com on behalf of Ruth Chung <rchung@usc.edu>

CheungChristopher W

Inbox

You replied on 6/1/2016 5:05 PM.

Hello Christopher,

I am glad to hear of your project and your interest in the AAMAS.

You have my permission to use it.

The manual is attached.

RC
### Asian American Family Conflicts Scale - Original (FCS-O)

The following statements are parent-child situations that may occur in your family. Consider how likely each situation occurs in your present relationship with your parents and how serious these conflicts are. Read each situation and answer the following questions using the following rating scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely is this type of situation to occur in your family?</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Almost
Never
|
| Once in a While
| Sometimes
| Often Or Frequently
| Almost
Always
|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How serious a problem is this situation in your family?</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not at All
Slightly
| Moderately
| Very Much
| Extremely
|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Situations</th>
<th>How likely is this type of situation to occur in your family?</th>
<th>How serious a problem is this situation in your family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decisions.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your parents tell you that a social life is not important at this age, but you think that it is.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You have done well in school, but your parents academic expectations always exceed your performance.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your parents want you to sacrifice personal interests for the sake of the family, but you feel this is unfair.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your parents always compare you to others, but you want them to accept you for being yourself.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your parents argue that they show you love by housing, feeding, and educating you, but you wish they would show more physical and verbal signs of affection.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your parents don't want you to bring shame upon the family, but you feel that your parents are too concerned with saving face.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your parents expect you to behave like a proper Asian male or female, but you feel your parents are being too traditional.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You want to state your opinion, but your parents consider it to be disrespectful to talk back.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your parents demand that you always show respect for elders, but you believe in showing respect only if they deserve it.</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thank you for the interest in my measure. I have attached a copy of the scale, including different versions, scoring procedures, select references, and terms for usage. To score the subscale, simply sum the items from each subscale and divide by the total number of items. To create an overall family conflict intensity score, sum the two mean item subscale scores and divide by 2. If you need to translate the scale, please use a translation back-translation method with independent translators. I also would appreciate a copy of any translation and the English back-translation. You may use any version. Please read the terms for usage and let me know if they are acceptable prior to use of the scales. Best, Rich

Richard M. Lee, PhD, LP
Editor, Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology
Professor of Psychology | University of Minnesota
APPENDIX H
STUDENT LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE (SLSS)

**Directions:** We would like to know what thoughts about life you have had during the past several weeks. Think about how you spend each day and night and then think about how your life has been during most of this time. Here are some questions that ask you to indicate your satisfaction with your overall life. Circle the words next to each statement that indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. For example, if you Strongly Agree with the statement “Life is great,” you would circle those words on the following sample item:

**Life is great.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is important to know what you REALLY think, so please answer the questions the way you really think, not how you should think. This is NOT a test. There are NO right or wrong answers.

1. My life is going well.
2. My life is just right.
3. I would like to change many things in my life.
4. I wish I had a different kind of life.
5. I have a good life.
6. I have what I want in life.
7. My life is better than most kids.

---

Permisson to use scale
December 27, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to verify that Christopher Cheung has successfully implemented a four session curriculum pertaining to Building Bicultural Competence among Asian American youth. This curriculum was conducted at the Chinese Baptist Church of Miami with the church’s full support of Christopher’s program.

If further information or clarification is needed, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Russell Williams
Assistant Pastor

Chinese Baptist Church of Miami
595 SW 124th Ave.
Miami, FL 33184
(305) 551-0138
pastor-russell@cbcmiami.org
Christopher Chuang’s Workshop with Chinese Baptist Coral springs

Scott Ryan <scott.ryan@cbccs.org>
To: Christopher Cheung <cheung.c28@gmail.com>

CHIRS, PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF YOU NEED ANY OTHER INFO. THANKS BROTHER!

To Whom It May Concern:

Christopher Chuang has completed his dissertation workshop on Asian-American identity with our youth group at Chinese Baptist Church of Coral Springs. I appreciate Chris’ work with our youth.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Blessings,
Scott Ryan
Assistant Pastor (English Ministry)
Chinese Baptist Church of Coral Springs
scott.ryan@cbccs.org
(954)255-9910
www.cbccs.org
Dear Committee,

I, the youth pastor, on behalf of Korean Baptist Church of Gainesville approved Chris Cheung to hold his workshop with the youth ministry consisting of sixth through twelfth graders.

7868634149
Kevinlo610@gmail.com
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Christopher Wing-Yan Cheung is the son of Cheung Chi Ping, and Li Mei Lai, the middle child of three sons, Laurence Cheung and Ricky Cheung. Christopher completed his undergraduate degree at Florida International University in 2009. He earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in general psychology and graduated magna cum laude. Christopher began graduate school in the School of Education at the University of Miami in 2010 and earned his Master of Science in Education degree in 2012, with a specialization in Marriage and Family Therapy. He enrolled in the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida in 2013, and earned his Doctor of Philosophy degree in 2017.

Christopher first became interested in counseling in 2010 through his work as in-home support with New Way Day, Inc. in Miami, Florida. At the time, he was also a volunteer crisis helpline counselor at Switchboard Miami. He provided crisis counseling, phone counseling, and referral services. Christopher also worked as an intern at Baptist Health Hospital Adolescent Substance Treatment center. His role was to provide individual, family, and group counseling with adolescents facing substance abuse issues. As a doctoral student, he was a registered intern working at University of Florida Shands Pediatrics in Gainesville, Florida. He provided youth behavioral health services, consulted and collaborated with medical professionals, and family counseling services.

Christopher aims to complete the requirements necessary to obtain his license as a Marriage and Family Therapist. His current goal is to further his career as a Counselor Educator. His focus is to advance the counseling field in the area of East Asian American mental health and family counseling.